

I have set forth in general outline the result of the committee's deliberations. They have made some important modifications in the regulations, and these will come up when we consider the Bill clause by clause. What I thought of suggesting to my hon. friend was this: In view of the fact that this whole matter has received such full consideration by a committee of the House composed of members from both sides, and as this resolution simply carries out the report of the committee, which has already been approved by the House, could we not permit this resolution to pass, upon which I would at once introduce a Bill so that it may be printed and placed in the hands of the members at the earliest possible opportunity. Then when the Bill comes up, the whole matter could be further discussed. I shall be glad to answer any questions hon. members desire to ask.

Mr. McKENZIE: I see no objection to the course proposed. It would be advancing the Bill a stage, and any discussion that could take place on this resolution can be had on the Bill.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I have in mind a concrete case that I presented before the committee, and which I have not heard the minister deal with, although I may have missed it. It is the case of a widow whose eldest son, her main support, was killed at the front. Her husband who was the clergyman of one of our leading churches, died while the son was overseas so this woman was robbed of both her husband and son. The Pensions Board almost immediately granted the widow a pension of \$480 on account of the loss of her son. Finding out a little later that she was receiving from a church pension fund the sum of \$300, which her husband had earned by reason of being a clergyman for many years, and which was a right coming to her outside of the war, the Pensions Board deducted \$300 from the \$480 and placed the widow on their pension list for only \$180. That seems to me a great injustice, and I should like to hear whether the board have power to deduct this \$300 which the widow was justly entitled to.

Mr. ROWELL: The question was considered at great length by the Committee as to whether income—I am not speaking now of earnings—which a widow might receive from any source, should be deducted in awarding a pension. While there is a great deal to be said in favour of my hon. friend's view, the judgment of the Committee was that they would be depart-

ing from the principle upon which pensions are granted to parents if they took into consideration income that was not earned. Therefore the hon. member's suggestion is not embodied in the Bill. When the Bill comes up and we are considering the clauses which deal with this matter the hon. member's suggestion may be further considered.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: I would like to draw the minister's attention to an anomaly under the old regulation whereby, if a widow entitled to a pension was working, the amount she earned would be deducted from the pension. To illustrate my point, let me give a concrete case. A widow in Montreal had two sons and one daughter; her sons were earning pretty good salaries and were taking care of her. They both went to the front and were killed, and the widow was granted a pension of \$80 a month. Finding that this was not sufficient to keep her daughter and herself she secured a position at \$70 a month. Only the other day she received a letter dated June 21, which I will read to the House:

Madam,—I have the honour to inform you that in accordance with recent legislation passed by the Government your award of pension has been reduced to \$10 a month.

This reduction will be effective from next payment.

Your obedient servant,

The Secretary,

Board of Pension Commissioners for Canada,
Per M.S.

So that she would get the same amount if she were not working. This is utterly unjust. If this woman has the energy and courage to earn some more money she should be entitled to her whole pension. I was glad to hear the minister state that under this Bill the amount of her earnings would not be deducted. I am bringing this matter to the attention of the minister for the reason that the date of this letter is the 21st June and it states that the decision is according to recent legislation. Another reason why I bring this matter up is that the report of the committee, as contained in the Votes and Proceedings of yesterday, does not specify this change in the legislation. I hope that in the interval this will be incorporated in the Bill.

Mr. ROWELL: The report presented to the House yesterday was accompanied by the Bill and the Bill does contain a provision to meet the case that my hon. friend has referred to.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: When will it be distributed? It is not printed yet.