

tunately, however, they cannot demonstrate this to the board. Injuries of this description are known in medicine as functional; they are more or less imaginary. There is no organic disorder, the patient's condition being due to nervous weakness which cannot be demonstrated. There is no actual change in the bodily structure. There are thousands of men in this country—I say this advisedly—perhaps tens of thousands in this category who have a moral right to consideration under this legislation but who will not get it. It is that type of man I want to reach.

Mr. McQUARRIE: The amendment proposes a reduction in the age limit of five years in regard to a certain class of the population. It may be possible, and I hope it will be, for the minister to reduce the general age limit to that extent.

The CHAIRMAN: Before there is any further discussion of the proposed amendment I may observe tentatively that in my opinion this motion falls in the same category as some of those proposed this afternoon. The amendment moved by the hon. member for Fort William seeks to have the age limit reduced to sixty-five years in the case of returned soldiers who have served in any theatre of war. The general age limit fixed in this bill is seventy years. The amendment would widen the scope of the bill in relation to returned men and, if adopted, would conflict with section 170 of rule 13, which provides:

The committee of supply cannot increase a grant which has been recommended by a message from the Governor General. It is also irregular to increase any item in a resolution. But any motion to reduce a grant will be always in order.

In my opinion the effect of this amendment would be to increase the grant contemplated and for that reason I am inclined to consider the motion out of order.

Mr. CLARK: Apart altogether from the question whether or not the amendment is out of order, I submit that it is quite in order for a member at this stage to discuss the proposed age limit. Before you rule on the admissibility of the motion, Mr. Chairman, if you have not done so already, I am going to ask the government to adopt the suggestion which has been made by the hon. member for Fort William and move it as a government amendment. I support it, not because I believe that it is going to meet the situation which is developing in this country to-day in regard to the prematurely old; I do not think it will do so. I took up this afternoon with the Minister of Soldiers' Civil Reestablishment a case which is typical of a great many

[Mr. Manion.]

and which will have to be dealt with by the government sooner or later if this country is to do its duty. We feel very strongly that the ordinary man who served in any theatre of war has been incapacitated to such an extent that his life, so far as its usefulness is concerned, has been shortened by at least five years. Certainly the period during which he will be able to provide for himself and his family has been reduced to that extent. The typical case I want to submit to the government is the one which I discussed this afternoon with the Minister of Civil Reestablishment. Here is a man who enlisted for service overseas and whose capacity apparently was one hundred per cent fit. He returns to Canada an invalid. After a couple of years his pension is commuted. He has been getting a small pension which is commuted to \$300. But in about another year the man has become practically eighty per cent disabled, and I want to say this—that the pension doctors admit that his disability is due to his war service. They admit that, or they admit it to this extent: They say that he is disabled eighty per cent, but that his disability has merely been aggravated by his war service and that he is therefore not entitled to the full pension provided for by the Pensions Act, but they give him a pension for the aggravation only. Now in the particular case that I have before me there are numerous affidavits filed with the department to the effect that the man was one hundred per cent fit when he went overseas. To-day the pension doctors admit that he is one hundred per cent disabled. He is an invalid, in bed; he has ten children, and he is 56 years of age. Two of his sons were killed overseas, and one won the military cross. Two returned and one is engaged in looking after his own wife and family. Another I think is not married but is looking after his own reestablishment. Of the other six one is dead, but the remaining five are young children. This man is on his back, and his wife has been obliged to keep a boarding house. She is breaking her health in an attempt to look after her invalid husband. This country says that man is only entitled to be paid a fifty per cent pension because his disability, as it is said, is only an aggravation of something that existed before. But the man was one hundred per cent fit when he enlisted, so far at least as his power to engage in his occupation was concerned. Now I say that that is not right; it is something this parliament should take into consideration. The case I have cited is of course an extreme case so far as the principle of old age pensions is concerned, but there are thousands of men