

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the amendment carry?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Yes.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

The CHAIRMAN: In my opinion the nays have it. I declare the amendment lost.

Mr. FIELDING: I want to state a case which I think is covered by subsection 7. To make assurances doubly sure I want to put the position before the minister. A widow lost a son who had been living at home. She had other sons who were living far away and who had their own affairs to look after, so that although they were earning something she could not look to them for support. She was living with a relative and the pension which she would otherwise have received was reduced on the ground that she did not have rent to pay because this relative had kindly taken her in. I know that the commissioners did the best they could, but it was wrong to reduce the pension. I understand that such cases as this are covered by the amendment in subsection (7). Am I right?

Mr. CRONYN: Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE: Subsection (7) provides that the pension to a widowed mother shall not be reduced on account of her earnings from personal employment or on account of her having free lodgings, or so long as she resides in Canada. Let me put this case before the minister. A woman residing in Halifax lost her son in the war—perhaps two sons—and has a daughter who is married in Boston. The daughter invites her to go and live with her in Boston. Why should the pension of that widow be subject to some reduction because the woman happens to go to live with her own daughter in the United States instead of living alone?

Mr. POWER: I have an amendment to subsection (6). I would move, seconded by the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Turgeon)—

The CHAIRMAN: Just a moment, Mr. Cronyn desires to reply to the hon. member.

Mr. CRONYN: The committee have treated pensioners residing in Canada on a somewhat different basis from those residing in the United States or elsewhere. There is no doubt that in the case put by the hon. member (Mr. McKenzie), if the widowed mother moved to the United States and were in receipt of an independent in-

Mr. Sinclair. 1

come that income would be deducted from the pension which she would otherwise be entitled to. So long as she stays in Canada, and has an income not beyond \$20 a month no deduction is made. When she crosses the border there is a deduction. That distinction is made between those who reside in Canada and those in the United States, and one of the reasons is that in the United States—I think I am right in saying this—the widowed mother gets no more than \$30 a month. That is the limit of the allowance in that country, and it would be unfair to have Canadians going over there and receiving perhaps very much larger amounts, having independent incomes as well.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): I do not think the United States has made any discrimination of that kind in regard to American pensioners living in Canada. I know of a great many people receiving pensions from service in the American war who have moved to Canada and are receiving their pensions just the same. If we are to reduce the pension of a widowed mother who goes to live with a relative in the United States, the United States might probably say, "We will do the same." Has that phase of the matter been considered?

Mr. McKENZIE: I do not think that residence in the United States should interfere with the little pension we give. I should not say "little" it is rather a respectable pension as pensions go that we are now granting. But that pension is earned. The death of the son and the Act of Parliament together secure to the woman the pension and it is her property. It is guaranteed to her, and it belongs to her while she lives. Why should we make a condition that she cannot go across the border and live comfortably with relatives? Why should that interfere with the money she gets? Why not let her go to the United States or wherever she wants to go and enjoy the full benefit of the pension under whatever circumstances may appeal to her? I do not see why we should be following this woman to see whether she goes to the United States, or whether she goes to Newfoundland or anywhere else. There are in this country a lot of women belonging to Newfoundland whose sons died in the war. Such a woman, in her old age, may go to Newfoundland, which is beyond the borders of Canada, and then under this section suffer some impairment of her pension. I do not think it is really worth while to make such a fine distinction as that.