

Mr. McINTOSH: May I ask the colonel for an opinion? He does not need to give this if he does not wish to do so.

Have you any formula that you apply at the present time to warrant an increase in the amount of money a recipient of war veterans' allowance is allowed to earn because of the increased cost of living? I do not know how much it has increased since the last ceiling was raised, but maybe you have those figures in your file. In other words, should we as a committee recommend that there should be an increase in the ceiling that the recipients of war veterans' allowance should be allowed to earn.

Mr. CROMB: That is studied from time to time. We are not speaking of the rates or the income ceilings, we are speaking of the casual earnings?

Mr. McINTOSH: That is correct.

Mr. CROMB: The amount of casual earnings they are allowed without affecting the allowance at the present time—and this is working exceedingly well—is \$600 for a single recipient and \$900 for a married recipient in any one year. Many of them do not make that much. I am quite sure a number could make more, but if they could make more the chances are that they are possibly employable.

The act, of course, was designed for those who have reached the age of 60 and are running downhill as far as health and strength are concerned, people who are unable to compete in the labour market. The casual earnings were designed just for a number of things that a veteran of that age could do if he felt so inclined. It is completely exempt. There is the problem of the veteran under 60 who, by reason of infirmity—medically approved infirmity, or lack of strength—comes on the allowance at an earlier age. If a veteran in that category started to earn a great deal the chances are that he would not be as incapacitated as he had thought he was, and it would not be good for him to stay on the allowance if he had more useful years ahead.

I would say briefly that the \$600 and the \$900 for casual earnings exemptions is working exceedingly well, and we hear very few complaints.

Mr. CHATTERTON: Would another factor be that those who are under war veterans' allowance because they are unemployable are quite often young fellows with dependant children whereas the other recipients have no dependants, and those who are unemployable are not able to earn money and, additionally they have dependant children?

Mr. CROMB: The War Veterans' Allowance Act, of course, is only designed to take care of veterans, widows and orphans. Orphans are recipients in their own right. The income of children is completely exempt; family allowance is completely exempt; mothers' allowance, and that sort of social assistance, is exempt. Therefore, when one has a case of a war veterans' allowance recipient with a number of children, he is able to benefit by the scope of social assistance so far as the children are concerned and it is not assessed as income by the war veterans' allowance board.

Mr. McINTOSH: Have you any figures in respect of the number of applicants or the number of recipients of war veterans' allowance which have been dropped during the past year because of obtaining more remunerative employment. What I am trying to get at is this. In some cases and, as you say, not many, there have been elderly veterans who have been able to get caretakers jobs, which would not give them a complete living without the assistance of the war veterans' allowance, and because of being afraid of losing out or because of the problem they had in getting war veterans' assistance in the first place and of losing that right they hoped that they could carry on, say, for another couple of months or so. In other words, they have to lay off for a couple of months, so they do lay off.