

and months of delay. I have been complaining about it for a long time. I do not know what has been done to correct it. What machinery is there?

The CHAIRMAN: Would you mind letting your question stand until we get to that particular part of the amending bill?

Mr. GILLIS: Well, he was talking about unemployment a moment ago.

The CHAIRMAN: I know. The witness put the whole statement in so as to have it before you. Perhaps you will not mind waiting.

Mr. GILLIS: I do not mind so long as we have an opportunity to bring it up to date.

The CHAIRMAN: We will be coming to it when we get to that part of the bill. Does that carry?

Carried.

Now, subclause (5)? That carries forward the same idea as in the original bill, except that the date is the 31st of October instead of the end of the war.

Carried.

Subclause (6): s. 26 of Revised Statutes, chapter 281.

Mr. HARKNESS: This is the one which you brought up a few minutes ago when I asked about the position of regular soldiers. As I understand it, subclause (6) provides that a man who remained in the regular forces has until the 31st day of October, 1957 in which to make his application. Is that correct? It would be a year from the date mentioned here, in 1956?

The CHAIRMAN: The original Act said June 30, 1948; and, of course, the same idea is carried forward into this bill.

Carried.

Now, before we pass on to the "Pension Act", Mr. Gunn is ready to deal with the clause which stood, that is, subclause (5) on page 3.

Mr. GUNN: You will realize the reason I asked for a little time was that I did not want to give you a snap opinion on such an important point; I wanted to consider whether clause 26 of the War Service Grants Act would have a bearing on the question of succession duties. Just let me read it:

Chapter 289, War Service Grants Act, R.S.C. 1952, section 26, subsection (1), reads as follows:

26. (1) No gratuity payable or credit available to a member of the forces or his dependants is subject to attachment, levy, seizure or assignment under any legal process or to taxation.

In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, that expression "or to taxation" covers the question raised, and I would say that a succession duties Act would not have any contrary bearing. I think that is all.

The CHAIRMAN: Carried.

Now we come to "Pension Act", and clause 5, subclause (1), "Application of Revised Statutes, Chapter 207"; that is the Pension Act:

Mr. QUELCH: Is the operation of the insurance principle limited to the period of time defined under subclause (b) of clause 2? What I have in mind is this: what is the situation regarding Canadians who are over there at the present time? Suppose a soldier incurs a disability. Is it automatically pensionable or does it depend on whether or not that disability was incurred on duty? Suppose he receives a pass and while he is on, let us say, a 24-hour pass, he receives a disability. Would it be pensionable?

The WITNESS: I think, Mr. Chairman, that for a soldier serving in Korea at the present time is, the same rules apply as to his service in the regular forces in this country; that is to say, any disability has to be attributable to service.