

been asked by the Prime Minister, but my objection to the section was not based mainly on that question. I would move that subsection (6) be stricken from the Bill. It provides that if an unmarried son is living with a parent or person in the place of a parent and is in the opinion of the commission earning a sufficient amount to permit him to contribute to the support of such parent, he shall be deemed to be contributing not less than \$10 a month. I think it is most unfair to take \$10 off the pension of a widowed mother just because she has an unmarried son living at home. I know of a case, which I called to the attention of the Pension Board, of a widowed mother with three sons, all of whom enlisted, and two of whom were killed at the Front. One son returned and was earning a pretty good salary, and under the former regulations a large amount was deducted on account of this son. Now it is proposed to deduct \$10 from his mother's pension. I do not think there is any justice or fairness in it. She should not be penalized because she has had a son able to go to the Front and who has been fortunate enough to return. She has done her duty by the country when, in the first place, she brought this son into the world, and in the second place, when she sent him overseas with his two brothers. It is unfair that she should be penalized because he returned. I therefore move that this subsection be stricken from the Bill.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. POWER: I said I intended to fight this and I am going to, if I have to move to amend every subsection. Early this session I moved the following resolution in the House:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient to amend the Act to provide pensions to or in respect of members of the Canadian Naval and Military Air Forces, 1919, so as to provide that the pension of a widowed mother of a member of the forces who has died on active service shall not be reduced on account of her income and further that pension shall be granted her of right whether or not there are other living children.

This resolution was debated in the House and there was not one dissenting voice. Hon. gentlemen opposite who are so keen to say nay when my amendment is put were the very first to support the resolution when I moved it in the House at that time. The hon. member for London, who is in charge of this Bill, was the most enthusiastic supporter of the resolution. The hon. member for Calgary, who I am

sorry is not in his seat, was another enthusiastic supporter of it. So was the hon. member for Skeena, the hon. member for Brantford, the hon. member for Gloucester, the hon. member for Westmorland, the hon. member for Victoria, the hon. member for South Vancouver, and so on.

Mr. COOPER: I was not present.

Mr. POWER: My hon. friend would have been in favour of it if he had been present I am sure. Now, simply because this matter was discussed by a special committee—and the committee was by no means unanimous on this question—are we to go back on a decision which was given three or four months ago in this House without a dissenting voice? Every man in the House then said it was a good thing, and that it should be adopted. The very words of the resolution are "that the pension shall not be reduced on account of her income." That is plain enough. But we are reducing it by subsection (7) if her income exceeds \$240 per annum. The resolution goes on, that the person "shall be granted her of right." There was no question whatever about her earnings or income. The pension was to be granted her of right "whether or not there are other living children." Every hon. member who was so ready to say aye, when the question shall this subsection carry was put, was just as willing to shout aye to this resolution when I moved it in the House. Is it because this is a Government Bill that they have changed their minds? Are they frightened, or I am sorry to say was a very gallant member yesterday by a threat of the Prime Minister that perhaps the whole Bill would not pass if we opposed one little clause? I am not afraid. I know that neither the Prime Minister or anybody else would dare go to the country and say that we are obstructing the passing of this Bill because we are fighting for the widowed mothers. I defy any hon. member or any minister to say that because we are asking for a little amendment to prevent the widowed mothers' pensions from being reduced that we are obstructing the whole Bill. I am insisting on this amendment. I had the unanimous assent of the House to my resolution at the beginning of the session, and now just because we are in the closing days of the session, am I to be refused that assent? I am tired of being told that the Bill must go through in a hurry. As long as I am able to continue the debate, I am going to do so.