

8-9 GEORGE V, A. 1918

Q. Now, in regard to dependents, they only get a pension when they are wholly or mainly dependent upon the principle that that dependency must have existed at the time the man enlisted?—A. No, at the time he died.

Q. At the time the disability occurred?—A. At the time he died, the disability was his death; a widowed mother cannot get a pension till his death.

Q. Supposing a man went overseas, and at the time he went overseas, he supported his mother, would she get a pension?—A. Yes. If he assigned her his pay and she got separation allowance, she would get the pension.

Q. What determines the "wholly or mainly dependent"?—A. We take each case up separately and consider it. A woman has perhaps \$40 in assigned pay and separation allowance, and she has also \$50 a month from a private income of her own; we would not grant her a pension because we would say that she was not mainly dependent upon her son, whereas if she had an income of only \$25 per month, we would say she was mainly dependent.

*By Mr. Nesbitt:*

Q. Supposing she had assigned pay, and she was refused the separation allowance and she had no income at all, and was dependent on her daughter?—A. If she were dependent upon her daughter, we would not give her a pension.

*By Mr. Redman:*

Q. I have met this case very often, and I think it is quite unfair. Take the case of two women, one keeps a boarding-house and is thrifty and has no other income at the time of his death, the other did nothing at all and had no income, and the woman who did nothing would get a pension, the other who was thrifty would get nothing at all?—A. We have heard this same argument by members of the House about thrift, but it is exactly what has been going on ever since Adam and Eve. Somebody has to keep those that are not thrifty, and there are many like them. The woman who does not need a pension, because she does something for herself, does not get it.

Q. And the other who does not do anything does get it?—A. She does get it. She has to be supported some way, and if she does not get the pension—

*By Mr. Ross:*

Q. She would work?—A. Supposing she could not work?

Q. If she is too lazy to work why should she be kept in laziness?—A. That is what they say in France where they do not give a widowed mother a pension at all until she is sixty years of age or incapacitated. The Government there says to the widowed mother: "Until you are 60 years of age you have to work, after that you get a pension." But if we did that in Canada, if we said to the mothers, we have had them all the way from 39 years upwards, widowed mothers applying for pensions, if we said to some of the women who are accustomed to being supported by their husbands: "You are only 45 years of age, you will have to work until you are 60," there would be an uproar.

*By Mr. Nickle:*

Q. Is there not an anomaly existing to-day. Here is a boy earning \$1,200 or \$1,500 a year, who goes overseas, and his widowed mother says she is wholly or mainly depending on him, and gets a pension?—A. Yes.

Q. And here is another boy living with his mother, and is earning \$2.50 a day, his mother is keeping a boarding house, and that boy goes overseas and gets killed, and his mother gets no pension because she was not wholly or mainly depending on him?—A. Yes.

MR. NICKLE:—I do not think that is fair.

[Mr. Kenneth Archibald.]