

government should step in and take it, any more than in any other case. They are separate issues: the veteran has an entitlement now under the legislation separate from any other assets. For example, if I have a lot of life insurance the pensions commission or government does not say, "Now your wife does not need any pension." In that case, they pay it anyway, but if it comes from someone else it appears to be a different situation. If it comes from an insurance company insuring the person who caused death the government steps in on it. There are two different outlooks on it.

Mr. HERRIDGE: Mr. Chairman, might I ask Mr. Anderson a question?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. Herridge.

Mr. HERRIDGE: Would the same situation apply if the widow inherited money from relatives, or something of that sort? Would she lose her pension on that account?

Mr. ANDERSON: No, the same situation would not apply. Sections 20, 21 and 22 only come into effect when the widow of the veteran who is killed takes action against a third party and collects damages. That is, she has already been compensated from one source for the identical thing she is seeking compensation for from another.

Mr. STEARNS: If settlement was made out of court, instead of going into court, and she received \$5 or \$10 thousand, the government would not come into it at all because there would be no court decision, is that right?

Mr. ANDERSON: That is a very good question. We probably would not even know about it.

Mr. WEICHEL: In the case of the rise in pension, would that include any changes at all in the widow's pension of \$115 a month? Are there any changes asked for in that, or would that be the same as now?

Mr. BELL: No, Mr. Chairman, not in the case of widows. Our recommendation only embraces present pensioners, their wives and dependent children.

Mr. HERRIDGE: Does your organization accept into membership all veteran amputees?

Mr. BELL: Mr. Chairman, any amputee who lost his limb, limbs or eyesight as a result of war service.

Mr. HERRIDGE: But no amputations other than limbs?

Mr. BELL: Or total eyesight.

We have positions for associate members in our organization, in the case of veterans who have received post-war losses of a limb or limbs. We admit them to associate membership, if they have served.

Mr. O'LEARY: Mr. Anderson, in your estimation of sections 20, 21 and 22, were you not, in effect, saying that the war pensioner's widow's pension is not by right but is a form of social legislation?

Mr. ANDERSON: No, I would not say that. It is paid as of right under the act, all right. All I said was it is a social welfare measure providing for her, particularly in the event where she receives it because the pensioner was in receipt of a 50 per cent or greater pension. If he dies of his pensionable disability then there is a slight difference. No matter what rate his pension is she gets the pension automatically. Where the pension is over 50 per cent the pensioner does not have to die of his pensionable disability. She is protected and in the circumstances that is a type of social legislation.

Mr. McINTOSH: I am wondering why the paragraph in respect of hospitalization treatment which was contained in the brief last year was left out of the brief this year. Is that because of the hospitalization plans? You mentioned last year that the question of free hospitalization and treatment of non pensionable disabilities of the war disability pensioners is one that has been of grave