

I would like to ask a question, Mr. Chairman, on Item 5, on the Corps of Commissionaires Services. Can Mr. Cromb explain that to us?

Mr. Cromb: No, that does not come under my jurisdiction.

The Chairman: Perhaps at this stage we could open up the scope of questioning and include Welfare Services. We have Mr. Tubb, Chief of the Social Welfare Division, with us today. Could you reply to any questions from there Mr. Tubb?

Mr. C. S. T. Tubb (Chief Social Welfare Division): Yes.

The Chairman: Do you have any special comments to make?

Mr. Tubb: No, I do not, Mr. Chairman.

If I may, I would like to introduce Mr. Bob Wood, Chief of Budget Administration, who was formerly District Administrator in Regina until about a year ago.

The Chairman: Mr. Webb, do you have a question?

Mr. Webb: I have a question relating to veterans' assets. I do not know how many there are, but there have been cases where veterans have laid aside a definite amount of money for their burial. Some even have receipts from funeral directors. I understand from the Department that this is counted as an asset. However, if these people had spent this money the Department would possibly have been required to assist them with their burial expenses.

Mr. Cromb: Mr. Chairman, each married recipient is allowed \$2,500 cash in the bank and is still eligible to qualify. In the case of a single recipient the amount is \$1,250. A recipient is also entitled to treatment and this can be ascertained through Dr. Ritchie when you are discussing his particular vote. We have known of cases where, in order to reduce his personal property to \$2,500, an applicant has expended something on a pre-paid burial. We do not consider this a proper expenditure of money.

Mr. Webb: Mr. Cromb, if these people dispose of their money and it falls back on the Department to undertake their burial expenses I do not really see the point.

Mr. Cromb: I am wandering into someone else's territory, perhaps, but there is the Last Post Fund which is also available to veterans.

The Chairman: Are there any other questions?

Mr. Chatterton: Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question of Mr. Tubb? Could he give us an explanation of the \$37,000 for the Corps of Commissionaires Services? Is this a contract under which they perform services for you?

Mr. Tubb: This is the purchase of commissionaires' services at, I think, seven of our district offices.

Mr. Chatterton: Mr. Tubb what is the maximum monthly allowance under the Assistance Fund?

Mr. Tubb: Permissible?

Mr. Chatterton: Yes.

Mr. Tubb: The maximum amount that a married recipient can receive is \$840 a year. This has increased from \$360 a year in 1964, consequent on the amendments to the ceilings.

Mr. Chatterton: Am I correct that the allowance under the Assistance Fund combined with the allowance under the War Veteran's Allowance Act must not exceed the maximum permissible income?

Mr. Tubb: That is correct.

Mr. Chatterton: Does that \$840 apply regardless of the number of dependants? It is not made on the basis of so much per dependant?

• (11:40 a.m.)

Mr. Tubb: When we calculate need, Mr. Chatterton, we take into account the food needs of dependant children. There is no other calculation concerning children when we are dealing with a monthly supplement. If we are dealing with a need for emergency assistance then one of the items for which we can provide is the care of children, and this might include textbooks, travelling costs to school and things of that nature, as well as clothing.

Mr. Chatterton: The maximum allowance can never exceed the \$70 per month?

Mr. Tubb: That is correct.

Mr. Chatterton: May I just say that I think the increase from \$360 to \$840 was a good move, but I still think that the point was missed in that the amount allowable should be based on the number of dependent children. It would be more equitable if the amount of the allowances was based partially on the number of dependant children. Regardless of whether