

The Address—Mr. Adamson

part of the brief presented by the Canadian Legion. One of the most interesting facts about briefs which have been presented by the Legion to various parliamentary committees has been their dignity and their air of reasonableness in the requests for those things they consider right and proper, which I am sure the rest of us consider in exactly the same way. The Legion recommended:

1. That the basic rate of our war veterans allowance be increased to \$50 a month for single recipients and \$100 a month for married recipients, and that the income from other sources be permitted up to \$250 for a single person for a year, and \$500 for a married one.

2. That where a recipient is permanently and completely unemployable and has no other income, the W.V.A. rate be \$60 for a single person and \$120 for a married veteran.

3. That consideration be given to the plight of children whose parents are on W.V.A.

4. That W.V.A. benefits be extended to Canadian veterans living outside Canada.

The reason for these grants or allowances is that those who receive them are suffering ill health today because of service in the forces. But their incapacity is such that they cannot obtain a pension. I am sure every hon. member has on his desk many piteous letters setting out the plight of these people.

Meantime the government continues to do nothing. The attitude of the government toward these people is nothing short of niggardly. Today a married veteran under this allowance receives \$70, whereas before the war he received \$40. But that \$40 bought much more than the \$70 he receives today. It is pointed out in the brief that the Legion is asking \$50 for single returned men and \$100 for married men.

Why do they do that? The answer is that they must receive that minimum because of the government's fiscal policy. It has decided not to introduce any controls or subsidies to curtail the cost of living. As a matter of deliberate policy the government is permitting prices to rise and those who are on pensions and allowances are suffering most severely. If the government is prepared to carry out this policy, then it ought to be prepared to fulfil its obligation toward those who are receiving these allowances that is to increase their purchasing power.

The only answer we get is that there will be a committee next year to study the matter. The need is going to be great next year, let there be no doubt about that. But it is just as great today. Many of these people cannot afford to wait until perhaps next June, when a committee may give its approval to some increase. If the government was prepared to increase the amount paid to war pensioners, then there is no reason why it could not

have gone ahead and increased these allowances under the War Veterans Allowance Act.

As the hon. member for Melfort (Mr. Wright) pointed out the other evening, those who are in receipt of these allowances are individuals who contributed in no small way to the welfare of Canada. They have contributed through their years of service and through impaired health, and they have a moral right to ask for greater consideration than they are now receiving.

I do not know why the government is not prepared to yield to the request of the Legion and the request of many hon. members that this allowance be increased. It cannot be a lack of money. Obviously, we are going to finish up this year with a large surplus and there would be more than enough to pay an increase in war veterans allowances. Nor do I think the reason is expenditures on defence. We realize the money being spent on defence is an essential expenditure; but let us remember also that we have a responsibility to those who are in need today, the very men who defended us.

Mr. Rodney Adamson (York West): Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss a problem of great importance, one with which I shall deal through the medium of a single case. I refer to the whole question and problem of security and loyalty. I shall refer in detail to the case of one Robert Jackson, to which I referred briefly on an earlier occasion in the house. In discussing this matter I shall require to use a certain amount of evidence now before me, and I trust hon. members who are present will bear with me while some of this material is placed on record.

I had considered moving the adjournment of the house to discuss this matter, because its importance far transcends the single individual with whose case I shall deal this afternoon. I would also suggest to the government through you, Mr. Speaker, that at this session, owing to the fact that there is no budget, private members do not have the opportunity to raise grievances. Without a budget there are no motions to go into supply and therefore no opportunities to express these grievances.

I speak therefore in this debate on the speech from the throne, despite the fact that at the present time speeches at this stage of the debate have about the same effect as spitting into the Pacific ocean would have in raising the level of that body of water. The fact that there are only twenty-four members in the chamber at this time, only four more than a quorum, emphasizes my point.