

Mr. Cromb: In the War Veterans' Allowance Act we have authority to administer the allowances with the permission of the settler to pay the Veterans' Land Act in order to protect his home. So far as a WVA recipient qualifying for the Veterans' Land Act is concerned, this is a financial matter which would have to be dealt with by the Veterans' Land Act people.

Mr. Chatterton: Perhaps Mr. Pawley would have a comment on that?

Mr. Pawley: Mr. Chairman, if a veteran receives war veterans' allowance, while he may apply and possibly be qualified under the Veterans' Land Act, he cannot be established when receiving the allowance. However, if the veteran was established under the Act and ultimately, for some reason or other, was in receipt of war veterans' allowance then, of course, the allowance is continued and no distinction is made.

The reason for this is that in the War Veterans' Allowance Act there is provision to permit payments monthly from the allowance but there is no provision to establish a veteran if he is already in receipt of war veterans' allowance. Our Act is for the rehabilitation of the veterans and the War Veterans' Allowance Act is really for the benefit of the burnt-out veteran, and it seems incompatible to us to give a person the advantage of the two Acts.

Mr. Chatterton: May I ask whether the preclusion of war veterans' allowance recipients from future establishment under the Veterans' Land Act is governed by regulation?

Mr. Pawley: It has been a basic policy since about 1945 that a veteran receiving war veterans' allowance cannot be established under the Veterans' Land Act. One of the prime reasons is that in our legislation a man must have a permanent job. I do not believe you can construe a war veterans' allowance as income from a permanent job. Mind you, this has been an age-old problem.

There is another aspect. Under the Veterans' Land Act, the minimum acreage and other concepts of the Act require the person normally to be established outside cities and probably outside suburban areas. I think it is generally agreed that recipients of war veterans' allowance should be close to means of transportation and other amenities which permit them to live a little better life and not be somewhat isolated in rural or semirural areas.

Mr. Chatterton: Mr. Chairman, I hope the members will not think I am joking when I explain this totally anomalous position. Where a veteran is established under the Veterans' Land Act he can become eligible for war veterans' allowance either by becoming 60 years of age with the necessary eligibility, or by way of being unemployable. In other words, he can get benefits under the Veterans' Land Act and then subsequently obtain benefits under the War Veterans' Allowance Act. But if he receives war veterans' allowance benefits first, then he cannot qualify under the Veterans' Land Act.

I am not blaming the War Veterans Allowance Board, incidentally, and I am not blaming the officials of the Veterans' Land Act either. It is this policy which has been a long standing anomaly and Mr. Pawley's description of the intent of a veteran living on land, for instance, that he must be able to handle a certain acreage.

At the last meeting we heard that a new Order in Council is being submitted which will allow the Director to decrease the acreage where the veteran has a disability, whether it is attributable to war service or not. That discretion could be granted to the Director so that argument does not apply.

Furthermore, I must point out that in many cases, particularly in the case of a veteran who receives war veterans' allowance because of unemployability, quite often he might be a young man, perhaps 35 years of age, and have four young children. If he could receive the benefits of the Veterans' Land Act to reduce his monthly rental payments, he would be in a better position to maintain his family.

If the Veterans' Land Act considers that a couple having an income of \$270 a month is not enough, then I think there is something wrong. I think it is about time this anomaly should be rectified. The same applies to an elderly couple in receipt of war veterans' allowance and maximum permissible income of \$270. They should be encouraged to use the Veterans' Land Act to reduce their rental payments and have their own place where they can have a garden and keep a few chickens. But now, as soon as a man receives war veterans' allowance benefits, he cannot qualify for benefits under the Veterans' Land Act.

The Chairman: Mr. Cromb do you have a further comment to make?

Mr. Cromb: No.

Mr. Kennedy: Mr. Chairman, I am looking at page 576. Although the overall totals re-