

Mr. PARLIAMENT: Under 60, I cannot answer that offhand, but I would say the great majority are over 60. I would say at least 75 per cent—about 70, possibly, but that is subject to correction.

The CHAIRMAN: Certainly it would be high because they cannot qualify in most instances until they are 55.

The WITNESS: I would imagine, Mr. Green—I do not know the figures but I would imagine that the people that might come under 60—in any case would be unemployable unemployed they would be able to qualify under section (4) in any event.

Mr. GREEN: Perhaps we could have some clarification on that from the chairman. Would anybody be able to qualify who was under 60 even if that age of 60 were removed from section 4?

The WITNESS: You see, I have always taken it that it is actually under section 3 (1) (c), which brings your veteran in under the age of 60, in which case he would come under the district authority. The section reads as follows:

- (1)(c) Any veteran or widow who in the opinion of the district authority
- (i) is permanently unemployable because of physical or mental disability, or
 - (ii) is, because of physical or mental disability or insufficiency combined with economic handicaps incapable and unlikely to become capable of maintaining himself or herself.

I have always assumed in any event that that person would be incapable of taking employment.

Mr. GILLIS: Well, Mr. Watts, I might say that I think there is a very rigid application as far as the widow is concerned at 55, and the proviso there on economic circumstances is not being carried out.

I knew a widow myself—I have had many cases like that—a widow with eight children, for example, living fifteen miles from a city or town, she is under 55 years of age and I have known applications like that to be rejected. There certainly is an economic handicap there. The woman with a house and eight children to look after cannot go out to get employment; she is fully occupied at home. There is a lot of that and that is one point I think was omitted in the Legion's brief.

The CHAIRMAN: If Mr. Gillis will permit me, without taking offence, I think the committee will be happier in our discussions if we proceed in the fashion in which we started, that is to say, to question Mr. Watts on his brief and possibly to suggest to him, if the committee wishes to do so, that he has omitted something or other, but I think we ought to confine as much as possible our discussion to these questions rather than examine into the legislation itself.

The WITNESS: I would like to make one remark there. That was definitely our intention, and I note we have not done so, to suggest that section 4 should be amended to include women over the age of 55. That was definitely intended to be in the brief and it is not in the brief and I am making the recommendation now for the sake of the record.

By Mr. Green:

Q. As a matter of fact, they are shown in section 3(2), which subsection refers to monthly rates, but they are not mentioned in section 4.—That is right.

Q. It seems an anomaly.

The CHAIRMAN: I am afraid we are getting into the matter of the bill. I have no objection, but it will prolong our proceedings.