

other kind of income and was single would receive under this bill, and I was told by the deputy minister that he would be entitled to receive \$70 a month. In the case of a married veteran, who had no other source of income, he would be entitled to received \$120 a month. If I remember the Legion brief, they asked for an income of \$60 and \$120 a month.

I think this bill is quite generous, but I am very fearful that if we neglect to return it to the government, but instead, send them some other proposal, there will be at least some considerable delay.

I have not been here as many years as some of the other hon. members, and I have no assurance when the bill might come back to us. I feel that many veterans throughout the country are quite anxious to get that extra \$10 or extra \$30 in the case of married couples.

I feel that we should not delay the bill and that we should pass it with, possibly, certain recommendations and send it back to the House as soon as possible. I am one of those who would like to see it go back to the House in the month of March so that the deserving veterans might get their increases in their April cheques.

Mr. WEAVER: When Mr. Bennett moved his amendment to section 3 there was no doubt in the mind of anybody what the procedure was, namely, that when the recommendation was made it would be accepted by the government. There is a great deal of difference, however, between that and the amendment which Mr. White moved and which is before the committee.

I very much like the term which Mr. Hanna just used, the term of "floor" rather than "ceiling", because if there was ever a floor, this bill puts a floor under the income of anyone who can qualify for the war veterans' allowance. All the talk about a ceiling is unrealistic; but the talk of a floor is realistic; and the more I look into the War Veterans Allowance Act, together with the present amendment, the more I see how well it is designed to do the job which is required of it.

For that reason I cannot take a chance to support this amendment at all. I want to see this bill made law. Therefore the sooner it is put to the vote the better, so that we can get this bill passed.

The CHAIRMAN: I would like to point out to the committee another question of order which comes up if we should decide this motion now. We have got the proposed schedules in front of us with certain amounts set out, and if we, instead, go on record as not being in favour of them and ask the government to consider different schedules, we have actually taken a decision in this matter; and if the government leaves our report there and does not accept it, then how are we going properly to revive that question? I leave it to the committee.

Mr. BROOKS: It would stand until we get their reaction.

The CHAIRMAN: But suppose we hear that they do not intend to accept it? We have already decided it as a committee. Why should we not pass the bill as it is and have this amendment considered as a recommendation which was brought before us? We would not, by doing this, endanger the bill.

Mr. GOODE: I was one, Mr. Chairman, who, you will remember, was ruled out of order in the last Veterans Affairs Committee on a matter of exactly this nature. I must not refer to that, but I do not think you will mind my bringing it to your attention. At that time I considered the terms of the motion were quite within the means of this country to pay, and I was quite sure at that time that the veterans of British Columbia were satisfied with the terms of that motion.

Here we are giving it to them. This is what they wanted at that time. I do not think there is too much difference between the time when I moved my motion and this present time. But this, perhaps, is the big difference with this committee, namely, that the gentlemen who are sitting on the