

vided for in the War Veterans Allowance Act, under Part XI of the Civilian War Pensions and Allowances Act. These are the same rates as apply to merchant seamen who served at least six months at sea, and whose service must have included at least one trip through dangerous waters. The increase in the rates of the ceilings now proposed for the schedules of the War Veterans Allowance Act, I am informed, applies *mutatis mutandis* to Part XI of the Civilian War Pensions and Allowances Act. Therefore, members of the Newfoundland Overseas Forestry Unit will benefit to the same degree.

Senator Hollett made a particular point about the mainland foresters in World War II. My information is that these people were in the army, and as such were eligible for war veterans' allowances. But the Newfoundland unit was a civilian unit and, as I said, the Civilian War Pensions and Allowances Act, Part XI, applies to them, and they have the same rights and the same ceilings as they had under the War Veterans Allowance Act of 1962. I understand the difference is that they are not eligible for pensions under the Pensions Act.

**Hon. Mr. Brooks:** I think it came under compensation, did it not?

**Hon. Mr. Connolly (Ottawa West):** Yes, they are under the allowances act.

Senator White asked a number of questions last evening dealing generally with veterans' legislation. I say to Senator White, as I said some time ago in connection with a speech made by Senator Walker, that Newman once said that successive generations build upon the shoulders of the ancient, and we build upon the experience and the developments that our ancestors have produced. I think this is particularly true in respect of a good many of these programs, and generally speaking veterans' legislation from the First World War on through the second, and indeed through the so-called peace between the wars up to the present time, has been progressively liberal—with a small "l", of course—and as Senator Burchill has said, veterans' legislation in Canada is as good as if not better than that to be found anywhere else in the world. I think we are operating within that kind of framework.

Senator White asked, why did we do this through an appropriation act? Why didn't we amend the statute? That is a good question, and I may not be able to give as good an answer. It was done before and it was criticized, but all honourable senators will know what I mean when I say that probably the most effective and fastest way to see benefits turned into real benefits is not by means of a suggestion on a piece of paper,

even if that paper is a Government Order Paper in the other house. Perhaps the best way to accomplish the result desired is to do it this way rather than by amending the statute. I should point out, of course, that this bill is a statute and it is a perfectly legal way to do it; it is not a hidden way, since Senator White himself has seen it and we have been debating it. Certainly, if it was desired to do it before the end of the current calendar year, then this seems to be the most effective way of doing it. At any rate it is now before us.

Senator White suggests that the amount is not adequate or appropriate. He also has some criticism of the fact that pensions were originally based on wages paid to unskilled labour and that they should therefore now be increased by more than the amount proposed, since wages in the unskilled labour market are somewhat higher than the rates proposed here. Well, the last pension increase was given in May of 1961, and what the authorities have tried to do is to equate as closely as they could the change since that last amendment with the changes in the wage structure in the unskilled market. That is what the suggested new figures are supposed to reflect. Senator White himself pointed out that there are certain other fringe benefits which flow from these pensions—they are tax-free and there is protection for widows and children.

Senator White also wondered about the granting of pensions according to rank. I should point out that no increases in the rates payable to those who held a rank above that of captain, colonel or group captain in World War I are proposed, and in fact none have been made since the end of World War II. So, the rates for those who served in lower ranks are in fact gradually overtaking the rates payable to the higher ranks, and the time will come when the rates will be equal. I am informed that the American experience is that the rates for the lower ranks have in fact overtaken the rates paid to the higher ranks.

The distinction was made as a result of a precedent copied from the British legislation and which in those days was also in the American legislation. It is being eroded away and in time, perhaps quite soon, the two scales may be the same.

There is a difference, I suppose, between a situation like this, where you are dealing with veterans, and what you find in compensation cases in the courts. The comparison may be unfair, but if Senator White had two compensation cases arising out of a motor car accident, one on behalf of an unskilled labourer and one on behalf of an architect who commands huge commissions, then I think the