

nel in Canada and Newfoundland. There is a note which says some of the benefits listed might have expired. I do not know if it is necessary to run over the differences between the Newfoundland and Canadian allowances.

Mr. Hollett On the first note which says, "Some of the Canadian benefits listed might have expired before union and others would require adjustment for Newfoundland ex-servicemen", could your delegation tell me how many have expired up to date? Have you a record of that?

Mr. Ashbourne I have not got listed just what have expired.

Mr. Hollett Very well. We will pass on.

Mr. Ashbourne As to the difference between the Canadian and Newfoundland pension, in several cases they are similar. The point raised by Mr. Northcott as regards pensions of \$900 a year for 100% disability, I think it is the same, with the exception that under the Pensions Act of 1935, I do not think an ex-serviceman in Newfoundland can receive anything for children born after the last of May, 1934; whereas, under the Canadian act he is permitted a pension or some allowance, I believe, up to 1944. There is that difference.

Mr. Hollett Is there any great difference between the benefits veterans in Canada get and veterans in Newfoundland? We could get at the difference and find out where we would benefit if we went into confederation. Could you tell me that?

Mr. Ashbourne There were veterans' allowances and service benefits under the Veterans Lands Act — they are different. I think members will find these and also the re-establishment credits if they refer to the Black Books.

Mr. Northcott We get some concessions here, and as I see it, a little better.

Mr. Ashbourne As regards re-establishment credits:

Canada: A grant equal to the "basic gratuity" payable to those eligible to receive the gratuity. May be used for specific purposes listed below, any time within ten years of discharge provided the veteran resides in Canada and uses it for his own re-establishment in Canada. Persons not resident in Canada may use the credit to pay the premiums for insurance purchased under a Dominion government plan.

The "purposes" as I understand it were available to members who enlisted in the Canadian forces from Newfoundland, but on account of not enlisting in Canada, they could not benefit under them.

Purposes:

- (a) Purchase of a home — to provide up to two-thirds the required equity.
- (b) Repair or modernisation of a home already owned by the veteran.
- (c) To reduce indebtedness upon the home of the veteran.
- (d) To purchase household furniture and domestic equipment — up to 90% of the cost.
- (e) For working capital for a business.
- (f) To purchase tools, instruments or equipment for a trade, business or profession.
- (g) To purchase a business — up to two thirds of the required equity.
- (h) To pay premiums for insurance under a Dominion government scheme.
- (i) To purchase special training equipment.
- (j) For any other purpose authorised by the Governor-in-Council. This benefit is alternative with land settlement.

Mr. Hollett You will get it on page 76 of the Black Book if you will look for it.

Mr. Ashbourne What is that, Book 1 or Book 2?

Mr. Hollett Book 2.

Mr. Ashbourne Well if you have it there you could give it to us. If you have the amount there.

Mr. Hollett You are telling us. I am asking you a question, and you don't seem to know.

Mr. Ashbourne Well, I am not conversant with everything in this.

Mr. Hollett Well, let's have somebody who is.

Mr. Hickman In connection with those re-establishment credits, they are only available, or would be available, to those who served in the Canadian services. Consequently anyone not in the Canadian forces would not be eligible to the benefits under that act.

Mr. Hollett And as I understand it, according to Page 76, a grant equal to the "basic gratuity" ... is equal to \$15 per month outside the western hemisphere. You might check with somebody if that is not correct. I am only trying to let our veterans in this country know the true position in Canada, and the point which Mr. Hickman just raised is, and it is a point very well taken, that that particular section would not apply to any of our