

*Supply—Veterans Affairs*

war veterans allowances, and so on, represent a large proportion of the money required. The amount considered necessary for 1950-51 approximates that expended in 1949-50 owing to the fact that the level of travelling activity remains pretty steady.

**Mr. Fulton:** How much was spent last year actually?

**Mr. Gregg:** It was \$108,500.

**Mr. Fulton:** And the minister is asking for \$164,000 this year. Why is there that discrepancy?

**Mr. Gregg:** If the hon. member will cast his eye over the details in connection with war veterans allowances, particularly travelling and miscellaneous, he will note a very drastic reduction in many of those items, including that of travelling expenses. The reason for that is that during the year, for obvious reasons, we have transferred to welfare services many of the duties which formerly came under the war veterans allowance. So that there is this year some \$54,000 travelling expense money going into the veterans welfare service that will not appear in the war veterans allowance grant.

**Mr. Goode:** I notice that the travelling expenses of applicants and recipients amount to \$3,000 which was not covered by any amount in 1949-50. Can the minister explain that?

**Mr. Gregg:** In the other expenditures, such as hospitals and pensions, it will be noted that there is a large sum for veterans coming in to hospitals, including expenses and meals while they are there receiving examinations. Under the welfare division this year, even though there are not very many where the department needs to pay the expenses of veterans, there are some under this classification. So for the first time we have set up this amount, so as to keep those travelling expenses separate from the expenses of our own staff.

**Mr. Fulton:** I notice there is a considerable increase in the amount for professional and special services. What is the reason for the increase, and would the minister explain the services covered by this item?

**Mr. Gregg:** This constitutes medical examination, legal fees, social services and outside investigations. Again they reflect a transfer.

**Mr. Fulton:** From war veterans allowance?

**Mr. Gregg:** Yes.

**Mr. Harkness:** There is an amount of \$15,000 for advertising and publicity. Last year it was \$25,000. How much of the \$25,000

[Mr. Gregg.]

was spent last year, and what has been the necessity for advertising and publicity in this branch of the department?

**Mr. Gregg:** Under this vote we spent only \$3,500 last year. We asked for too much. This year the estimate has been set at \$15,000 for advertising and publicity expenditures related to the question mentioned by the hon. member a while ago. We do plan a modest advertising campaign on behalf of older veterans. Then there is the necessity for carrying out some advertising in connection with disabled veterans, or any other phase of the veterans welfare work. It also provides for general advertising when changes in regulations affecting rehabilitation benefits are made. Therefore we set the figure at \$15,000 this year.

**Mr. Harkness:** What form would this advertising or publicity take?

**Mr. Gregg:** Largely in veterans publications.

**Mr. Harkness:** Would that be by way of advertisement?

**Mr. Gregg:** Yes, display advertising in veterans publications, and occasionally in other appropriate journals.

**Mr. Gillis:** Is the program of vocational training still being carried on under the veterans welfare service?

**Mr. Gregg:** That matter could be discussed under item 555, I suggest.

Item agreed to.

531. Treatment services, \$34,389,177.

**Mr. Green:** Can the minister tell us whether the department is now in a position to provide medical care and treatment for the widows of veterans receiving war veterans allowance? They have been asking for some time that they be given that privilege. Hitherto the minister has not been able to arrange for them to get hospitalization. Apparently now, however, departmental hospitals are not as busy as they were formerly. That of course is evidenced by the fact that hospitals are being thrown open to all veterans who would not ordinarily be eligible, provided they pay their way. So it seems that there is now more accommodation available, and I am wondering whether it would not be possible to provide that these widows, who are commonly known as non-pensioned widows, might have that hospital treatment.

Then, in British Columbia we have a hospital insurance scheme. Under that scheme a veteran is compelled to pay the insurance premium to the provincial government, unless