the next ten years the cost, if the act were left as at present, would be \$42,000,000. If the age were changed to fifty-five the cost would increase to \$68,000,000.

Mr. POWER: Increased to or by \$68,-000,000? It increases from \$2,000,000 to \$4,-000,000 in one year, and I can imagine that if at one period it is \$42,000,000 it would increase to at least \$80,000,000.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Of course, a certain number drop off all the time; a number of them are dying.

Mr. POWER: But there is an upward curve that runs up to 1950 when it will be well over \$12,000,000.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I do not think these figures are wrong; they are dated just last week. If the age were changed from sixty to fifty the cost for the next fiscal year would rise from \$2,500,000 to \$7,500,000, and for the period of the next ten years the cost would be \$103,700,000 instead of \$42,000,000, which it will cost if the act is left as at present.

Mr. GERSHAW: I understand that a returned soldier may qualify for this allowance at any age if he is totally and permanently unemployable. There is a great deal of difficulty about proving that condition and I should like the minister to tell us what evidence he requires before admitting that a man is totally and permanently unemployable.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: They have to take the opinion of doctors; they are dependent upon a medical examination to be made by departmental doctors. In that connection it is rather interesting to note the different ages at which people are drawing this veteran's allowance. There is one man eighty-nine years old who is drawing it; one, eighty-eight; two, eighty-four; six, eighty-two; four, eighty-one, and then to go to the other extreme, there is one, thirty-two years; eight, thirty-three; twenty-one, thirty-four. That shows the tremendous spread in ages of those brought in under this act.

Mr. POWER: How was that man who is now eighty-nine years old ever allowed to enlist? He must have been sixty-nine when he enlisted.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: That is the extraordinary feature; sometimes they got in.

Mr. SANDERSON: Could the minister give by provinces the number who are receiving aid under this act?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: The figures are as follows:

Quebec. 624   Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Is. 402   Eastern Ontario. 321   Central Ontario. 1,564   Western Ontario. 405   Manitoba. 684   Saskatchewan. 330   Alberta. 529   British Columbia 1,698   New Brunswick. 198	er
Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Is. 402   Eastern Ontario. 321   Central Ontario. 1,564   Western Ontario. 405   Manitoba. 684   Saskatchewan. 330   Alberta. 529   British Columbia. 1698	
Central Ontario 1,564   Western Ontario 405   Manitoba 684   Saskatchewan 330   Alberta 529   British Columbia 1698	
Western Ontario 405   Manitoba 684   Saskatchewan 330   Alberta 529   British Columbia 1698	
Manitoba. 684   Saskatchewan. 330   Alberta. 529   British Columbia. 1698	
Manitoba. 684   Saskatchewan. 330   Alberta. 529   British Columbia. 1698	
Saskatchewan. 330   Alberta. 529   British Columbia. 1698	
British Columbia 1698	
British Columbia.   1,698     New Brunswick.   198	
New Brunswick 198	

Mr. MULOCK: When they are deciding whether a man is unemployable under this act, do they take into consideration his former occupation only?—because he is simply handicapped in the labour market to-day, and that is the difficulty in regard to some of these cases. If his condition as it was before the war in connection with the kind of work he was doing is to be the basis, I think it would be well if this were made known in certain districts, because there is a little misunderstanding on that point. As an hon, member stated a moment ago, that is the difficulty in deciding whether a man is employable or not. That is where the difficulty has arisen in quite a few cases under the act.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: To come under this act if he were under sixty years of age, he would have to be considered permanently unemployable.

Mr. COOTE: Is that absolutely so? I must confess I have not looked at the act for two or three years. I was on the committee that drafted it and naturally I used to be familiar with it. But my recollection is that a certain amount of casual earnings was permitted without the man being deemed to be ineligible for the allowance.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Certain casual earnings are allowable.

Mr. COOTE: My recollection is that there is a certain latitude in the case of small, casual earnings, but apparently that does not apply to a man under sixty.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: It is really the old age pension scale. We are allowing \$365. A single man would get \$240, but he would still get the \$240 if he had \$125 from some other source.

Mr. COOTE: That is if he is sixty years old or over?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: It applies in both cases.

Mr. COOTE: But in order to be considered as sixty before he reaches that age, he must be wholly unemployable?