

and telling him the facts. You can understand what that girl who is keeping up that home has been up against for the past fifteen months, eking out an existence on \$20 a month and with the care of that tubercular boy on her hands. She has him home with her now.

The treasury board, I think, were very short-sighted in not giving this case the examination it merited. The dependents' allowance board have dealt with the case. They have the regulations as they pertain to allowances for dependents of members of the armed forces; they have their investigators in the field, and they had an investigation of the case made by the proper officials. After all that was done, they made an award. After all that was done by people who considered the case from all angles, the treasury board vetoed the decision of the dependents' allowance board. That is why I bring it again to the minister's attention, so that he may have the case re-examined, and if the treasury board should still be of the same opinion as when they gave their first decision, they certainly should change it, because it was a sad reflection on the people who made that decision.

Mr. ILSLEY: I remember the case well. There are two parts to it. One is the application for an allowance because of the tubercular brother of the oldest daughter who was in charge of the household. As I understand it, the dependents' allowance board did not propose to make any allowance to her on account of the brother, because he was in hospital and his expenses were being provided for in another way. He was also receiving a small allowance, \$5 I think, for comforts and so on. So that the dependents' allowance board, if I understood the case correctly, did not consider that the brother came into it at that time at all.

The whole question was whether the principle should be laid down that where there are three grown-up girls, twenty-four, twenty and eighteen respectively, living in a house together, the government should pay to the oldest girl to provide for the home an allowance not provided for by the regulations except under the discretionary authority vested in the dependents' allowance board. So far as the evidence before the treasury board is concerned, there were three adult healthy young women to provide for that home, and the treasury board felt that unless there was some explanation for the necessity of making an allowance a precedent would be created which could not possibly be defended. The treasury board pointed that out; I pointed it out in my letter to the hon. gentleman, and asked him if there were any special circumstances which made it necessary

[Mr. Gillis.]

to establish a precedent of that kind. I also pointed out that if the brother came back to the home, the dependents' allowance board probably would make an allowance for looking after the brother, because that was a different thing; and if the brother did come back to the home I suggested that the hon. gentleman go to the dependents' allowance board.

With regard to the treasury board and how it should act, there are sections which provide that allowances are awarded as of right to dependents of members of the forces. There is another discretionary section, 119, which provides that outside of that range altogether the dependents' allowance board may make special awards which will be subject to review by the treasury board.

Now the treasury board can do one or two things. The treasury board can become a mere rubber stamp, shut its eyes to anything and everything that the dependents' allowance board does, and abdicate its functions as a reviewing tribunal. That is what the hon. gentleman has suggested that it do. Or, on the other hand, the treasury board can discharge its functions and do its duty just as it tried to do in this case.

Mr. GILLIS: I wrote to the minister on July 2 and answered fully with respect to the additional information required, and I also wrote to the dependents' allowance board on July 2. I have not received an answer from either board, and that is what caused me to bring the matter before the committee to-day. I came to the conclusion, because I had not received a reply from either board, that the dependents' allowance board were afraid to make another decision and that the treasury board was still waiting for the dependents' allowance board to do something. There are extenuating circumstances in this case which you will not run into every day. The oldest daughter has maintained the home since 1931. I think the minister will agree that the one adult daughter cannot keep up the home on \$20, and as to the other two girls they left that district because there is no employment for girls in that area. Approximately five hundred girls have left that area in the last couple of months to work in Ontario. I know 156 girls from that very town who left there to work close to Oshawa. That is why these girls were not able to make a contribution to the upkeep of the home, the home which was maintained by the older girl for eleven years. She has now a tubercular brother on her hands, and her father is in England fighting for his country. What incentive is there for a man to enlist if when