

The Address—Mr. Gillis

authority. If a man is doing a fairly good job by way of rehabilitating himself, after leaving a heavy industry, he should not be forced to retire at, let us say, 60 years of age, when there are many kinds of light work he might be able to do. Indeed he should be encouraged to do that work.

This matter of permitting casual earnings when a man is not capable of continuing his regular occupation should be given serious consideration. When they retire, as well as receiving their war veterans allowance—which alone certainly would not provide a high standard of living—they should be encouraged to contribute service to the community, and to earn what they can on the side. The government is not saving money by relegating men of this kind to the kitchen, by telling them they cannot augment their incomes. On the contrary, it is depriving communities of useful service by those men. The amount will always be too small. If you pay \$50 per month it will be too small, and \$60 a month will not feed, clothe and shelter a person today. But if a man is paid at least \$50 per month, then there should be greater latitude in connection with casual and permissible earnings. The recipient of veterans allowance should have a chance to do something for himself as far as the standard of living is concerned.

Mr. Mutch: I wonder if my hon. friend is not confusing casual and permissive earnings. He will remember that \$125 is permitted for a single man and \$250 for a married man as regular earnings, whereas casual earnings have no dollar limit provided they come within the description of not being regular. Is the hon. member advocating an increase in the permissive regular earnings? You cannot very well expand the casual earnings because there is no limit on them.

Mr. Gillis: I was suggesting a clarification of casual earnings and permissive earnings. In the case I cited, this man had earned \$285 a year and it was ruled that that was regular and therefore not permitted. He was not allowed anything; he was cut off completely. So he stopped working and the government gave him back the \$10 per month they had taken from him. The hospital lost his services. Everybody was hurt and the government did not save any money. A look should be taken at that particular angle.

I do not think there should be a limit. If a man is certified as being unemployable in the industry in which he has made his living and is granted a war veterans allowance of \$40, \$50 or \$60 per month, that is granted as of right because he is prematurely aged and cannot earn his living in the industry in which he had earned it

[Mr. Gillis.]

previously. That is given him as compensation. I do not think there should be any ceiling on other earnings. If that man can find employment, such as the man in the hospital to whom I have referred, as a doorman, an elevator man and so on and can earn \$50 or \$60 a month, he would still be below the normal rate of wages and salaries prevailing today. Such a man should be permitted to give to the country what service he can in order to supplement his statutory right just as long as he does not go back to his regular occupation and income.

I suggest that there should be no ceiling on earnings, so that those who are obliged to accept war veterans allowances may be encouraged to do something up to the time they are unable to do anything at all because of age or wear and tear. I leave this with the parliamentary assistant. I know that both he and the minister understand these matters. I am putting forward these facts so that when they meet the treasury board they will be able to argue with these people at the top level in this city who do not often come in contact with this kind of thing.

There is another point I should like to bring to the attention of the minister concerning the recipient of war veterans allowance who may be in one of the departmental institutions under the veterans' care arrangement. Many of these older veterans have no homes and when they get along in years and become a bit shaky they are not able to look after themselves properly. Then the department decides to place them in one of the departmental institutions. When the veteran goes into such an institution he gets his board and room, but they take away his veterans allowance. He is allowed \$8 per month for clothing and comforts. Eight dollars per month will not buy much in the way of clothing or very many comforts. If you roll your own cigarettes you may be able to keep on smoking, but you do not take in many shows or go for many taxi rides on \$8 per month. And you certainly do not buy much in the way of clothing. I suggest that a look should be taken at this.

Many of these aged veterans who are placed in these institutions will not be around much longer. I have in my hand a letter written to me on August 31 by a naval veteran of both wars who was in an institution in Halifax under the veterans' care arrangement. He passed on about a month after writing this letter. He was much concerned about this particular point, and he was a most reasonable fellow.

Apart from this \$8 per month not being enough to provide comforts and clothing, there is still another angle. If you attempt to let that \$8 per month accumulate, perhaps