

principle followed in the old employers' liability insurance scheme, which provided compensation for those injured within the scope of their employment? Is that what the minister is trying to tell the committee?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Yes—but not for overseas service, of course.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Are the young men who are taking the thirty days' training in the training depots, or the four months training as it is now to be, considered to be on active service? If so, if one of them is taken ill at a training depot and is sent to hospital and dies there, will his dependents be eligible for a pension?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Yes, if he incurred his disability as a result of his duties.

Mr. NEILL: I am thinking of a particular case—I know that is always unwise—of a man who was in the military service but not overseas, and in the course of his duties he was ordered to go on parade and play football. That was an order. He went on parade and was told to play football. He played football and got a severe injury to his head while playing. Somebody kicked him. They will not recognize that as entitlement to pension. I think he should be entitled to a pension.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Yes, if he was ordered to perform duties in connection with his service and was injured in the course of those duties I should say he would be entitled to pension. That would be a matter for interpretation by the commission, and they are disposed to be fair in their interpretations.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): How does that come within the scope of his employment?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): If he was ordered to do it, it would be a duty.

Mr. NICHOLSON: I understand that married men with the forces are granted an allowance for two children. In the event of a pension being granted, how many dependent children would qualify for pension, assuming there are four children left?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): They would all be entitled to pension if they are eligible under the act and are under sixteen.

Mr. SENN: Is there any provision for pension for aggravation of a disease while on service? I have in mind a man who after being in the service for some little time was found to have tuberculosis, but the doctor

stated he must have had the disease before he entered the service. There is no doubt that it was very greatly aggravated while on service. What happens in a case of this kind?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): My hon. friend is referring to one of the most difficult questions in pension administration, the aggravation of a condition such as he has mentioned. Under the old act, if aggravation took place, he would be entitled for the aggravation. There have been cases in Canada of men who have been only two or three months in the service and have developed chest or lung trouble. It is very difficult indeed to establish aggravation when the period of service has been short.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): The minister stated that approximately 20,000 men have been discharged and about 400 pensioned. What has been done to rehabilitate those who have been discharged and not pensioned?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): In my statement to the house on December 6 I gave an analysis of what we were endeavouring to do to rehabilitate these men. We have six or seven committees meeting every week to discuss this very problem and we trust that the new organization that is being set up of veterans' welfare officers, in cooperation with various other bodies, will ensure effective steps being taken. As my hon. friend knows, employment is the greatest difficulty. These men are already given preference in work on all government contracts in the departments of Munitions and Supply and Public Works, and facilities are being provided in the Department of Labour to give them preference in training. In every possible way we are doing what should be done so far as we can. This is also a question for further consideration by the special committee.

Mr. NEILL: Just one more point with respect to another class of dependents—mothers. It has been laid down by the government, and quite properly, that a wife shall receive \$35 a month, and if there are any children, \$12 for each child. She may be a young woman capable of doing all her domestic chores and perhaps a little outside work, which she is not prevented from doing by the regulations. That is the wife. She gets \$35 a month for herself. But if the dependent is a mother she is entitled to get only \$20 a month. You may say: The wife has children to support. But I answer that the married woman gets an allowance of \$12 a month for each child, and if she is to receive \$35 a month for herself I maintain that the aged mother, not perhaps able to do