

have been issued to those persons are protected from being invalidated.

Section agreed to.

Sections 2 and 3 agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

WAR VETERANS ALLOWANCES

PROVISION FOR NEGLECTED OR DEPENDENT CHILDREN, INCREASED PERMISSIBLE INCOMES, ET CETERA

Hon. MILTON F. GREGG (Minister of Veterans Affairs) moved that the house go into committee on Bill No. 196, to amend the War Veterans Allowance Act.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Golding in the chair.

On section 1—"Orphan".

Mr. WHITE (Hastings-Peterborough): We have not had any opportunity to go over the bill to see whether the amendments approved by the committee have been incorporated in the bill. If the chairman does not mind my jumping ahead a few sections, I am principally interested in section 6, which provides for the increase to \$250. Has that been carried throughout the bill?

Mr. GREGG: The bill now before us is based upon the recommendations made by the special committee on veterans affairs. It is exactly as reported to the house by that committee.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings-Peterborough): I do not know whether the minister wishes me to make my remarks on this first clause or on the sections in which we are interested as we reach them. My remarks will apply principally to clause 6.

Mr. GREGG: Perhaps we could have any discussion on the section to which it applies.

Mr. LENNARD: I have a few remarks to make which are not particularly applicable to any section. I refer to the brief which was presented by the British Canadian veterans on May 10. As many hon. members know, on May 6, 1946, they presented a brief to the veterans affairs committee of that year. The brief which was presented to the veterans affairs committee on May 10 of this year was one of the most complete and fairest briefs presented to the committee. It was presented by Stephen Jones, Toronto, supported by George MacKay of Hamilton. All that they asked for was entitlement for those British Canadian veterans who served in an actual

theatre of war and who had twenty years of continuous residence in Canada. They pointed out that the British Canadian veterans who had resided continuously in Canada for twenty years after the first great war had been paying taxes. They had raised their families. They had contributed to the federal treasury from which all federal expenditures, including war veterans pensions, are paid. Their sons and daughters had served in the second great war and were prepared to serve again. To all intents and purposes they should be on an equal footing with the Canadian-born veteran. I believe that myself, and I am disappointed that the recommendation was not passed in the veterans affairs committee. I may say I had the privilege of moving the following resolution which was defeated:

That the committee recommend that the appropriate section of the act be amended to allow that the benefits of the War Veterans Allowance Act be extended to veterans who served with the imperial forces in an actual theatre of war other than the British isles, and who had no pre-war domicile, but whose period of continuous residence in Canada has reached twenty years.

I felt on several occasions that this resolution would meet with the unanimous approval of the committee, but we found that it was voted down. As I say, I was disappointed, because the number of British Canadian veterans who would be involved was such that we could very well have adopted this resolution. I consider that an injustice has been done to those veterans of the first great war. It is true that they were not promised anything. They were not enticed to this country with any promise of that kind. Because of their continuous residence in Canada and their good citizenship, they are most certainly entitled to these benefits.

Another matter that should have received some consideration is contained in a brief presented by Canadian non-pensioned veterans' widows. Some of their points were well taken. This was fully covered by the committee, and I do not intend to deal with it section by section. I merely mention that it should have received more consideration. Probably I shall have more to say when we deal with the various sections of the bill.

Mr. QUELCH: I find myself in general accord with the remarks of the last speaker. The bill that we have before us is undoubtedly a better bill than the one which went to the committee, just as that bill made certain improvements upon the war veterans allowance as it exists today.

When the pensions bill came back to the house I congratulated the minister upon the