

persons other than wives, children and so on, who in certain cases are entitled to dependents' allowance. The stipulation is made that where such other persons as are referred to in this section are in receipt of \$65 of other income they are therefore not entitled to the dependents' allowance. I think I can state what I have in mind best by giving briefly the details of a case. It is the case of an enlisted man who was the only son in a family. The father had been an invalid for a good many years. The son during his employment before he enlisted contributed regularly to the support of the family. It is also true that his mother was working, making the sum of \$75 a month. Owing to the father's invalidity it was not possible for the mother to maintain the home on that amount. Accordingly the son made a contribution month by month. Upon enlistment he immediately assigned \$20 a month to his mother, or father—I am not sure which it was—and while he was still alive did his best to secure a dependents' allowance. That allowance was not granted. Unfortunately he has become a casualty, and since his death any effort to have a pension awarded to the mother or father has been refused, on the ground that dependency was not established during the lifetime of the enlisted man. Of course, in the correspondence I have had with the dependents' allowance board on this matter, the board has had no other recourse than to quote this provision to me, namely, paragraph (c) of article 102. I feel that this limit of \$65 is perfectly justifiable where there is only one person who has been dependent upon the enlisted man. But there must be a great many cases such as the one I have recited, where the father is an invalid, and where the mother is at work. Her income, as was pointed out the other night by the hon. member for North Battleford, is less since she is a woman, than that of a man, and she finds her position quite difficult. So long as her son was working before the war his contribution enabled them to carry on, and while he was in the forces his assigned pay, although not as much as he was contributing before the war, nevertheless made it possible for them to carry on. When that is cut off, their position is an extremely difficult one, and it seems to me that not only should consideration be given to this particular case but there must be others like it.

The suggestion I should like to make is that some amendment be made to this paragraph, so that when "the other person" defined in this

section is a mother who has to support an invalid husband, at least that \$65 ceiling be raised to a more adequate amount.

There is one other section in the same book of regulations to which I wish to refer before the minister makes a reply. This time it is to article 61, subsection 1 (a) and subsection 3. They relate to the necessity which is laid upon paymasters to have men paraded before them in order that they may be advised of the details of the dependents' allowance regulations. According to these subsections, the instructions seem to be quite definite, and I hope it is not out of order to ask whether they are being carried out. I ask that question because one specific case has been brought to my attention, and I have been told of others. This particular case is that of a widower who enlisted and left his child in the care of his father, the child's grandfather. Immediately upon enlistment he made an assignment to his father of \$15 a month, and later on he learned that had he made an assignment of \$20 a month in favour of his daughter she would also get dependent's allowance. He forthwith made that change, but his effort to have it made retroactive, either to the date of enlistment or to the date of the original assignment, was in vain. His complaint to me is that he was not advised when he enlisted that such was the situation. I have been told that there were other cases.

Mr. RALSTON: He was not advised?

Mr. KNOWLES: He was not advised of the details. I put a question on the order paper along this line some time ago, and it was passed as an order for return but it has not yet been brought down. I should like to know whether something could not be done to make sure that all men on enlistment are advised of the details concerning dependents' allowance regulations, and in particular that they are advised that it is necessary to make these assignments of pay in order to have dependents' allowance granted. Would the Minister make some comment on these two matters, the one relating to article 102 and the other to article 61?

Mr. RALSTON: In reference to the first case, I can only ask my hon. friend to leave it with me. I take it that what he wants to know is whether it is possible to have article 102(c) amended so that the limitation of \$65 might not apply in the case of a person, a mother, who is supporting other dependents. I would ask my hon. friend to leave that for me to take into consideration. The case was not brought to my attention before; I have just asked the officer who is with me about it, and he says it is rather a special case. I will see what can be done about it.