

Mr. Higgins That point of Mr. Butt's is rather important, I think. All the allowances are "may", not compulsory.

Mr. Ashbourne As far as I understand the idea, the allowances are there for men who meet the required conditions.

Mr. Job It does not say so.

Mr. Ashbourne What is the idea of having it there at all if it is not available for the men? If there is no war veterans' allowances, what is the good of putting it there?

Mr. Butt They have tied it up in Canada by writing it down in a nice neat act. Here the net result is practically the same.

Mr. Smallwood What kind of nonsense is that? What kind of trash and nonsense is it in fact? Here is a law in Canada which, as I pointed out before, may be interpreted generously, or in a mean and niggardly spirit. Canada is not noted for treating her veterans in a mean and niggardly spirit, she is noted for treating them generously. Because the act says "may" and not "shall", shall we interpret it as being in a mean and niggardly spirit that that will be carried out?

Mr. Butt Mr. Chairman, I assume no such thing, and I would not dream of doing any such thing. I think Canada is a great nation, and anything I say is not anti-Canada. I admit quite freely that they have done great things for their veterans, and for their citizens for that matter. I admit that, but I do want to find out the truth of it. Here we have a known parallel, but it is not put down in an act.

Mr. Ashbourne Well, that's questioned as to whether or not we have that parallel. Of course the GWVA and the NPA as has been pointed out, has certain provisions for men who apply for them, but in this veterans' charter, sir, which is a book of 300 and some pages, the members can readily see the very same words as has already been read here, or printed here. I will just reiterate them for members to check against them. "In Canada ... may receive an allowance." Well, then he may receive the allowance. That is for the veterans' allowance, and that is the law in Canada.

Mr. Butt And the word is "may", and that's the right word.

Mr. Chairman The point is that in statutory law "may" is permissible, and "shall" is mandatory. Therefore Mr. Butt takes the position that there is nothing mandatory in there. Therefore the point

for which he contends is that the act from which you have quoted is not mandatory at all, and in its operations it is purely discretionary.

Mr. Butt They had to use the word "may" in order to protect themselves against cases which may be an abuse. They have to use the word.

Mr. Ashbourne If that's the word they had to use, and it is there, I presume it is right.

Mr. Chairman Mr. Butt's point is simply this: that it must not be assumed that that action shall be applied. Quite obviously the word "may" is used to permit investigation, and if, upon investigation it is found that there is no fraud employed then the matter I presume will, as a matter of fact, be granted.

Mr. Butt I really don't like to have an opinion I give called trash and nonsense. In this particular case, according to what you just mentioned now, I even knew what I was talking about.

Mr. Hollett Mr. Chairman, before you leave that point may I also point out that in the case of a veteran who has reached the age of 60 years, or a veteran of any age who, because of his disabilities is not...

Mr. Chairman From what are you quoting?

Mr. Hollett From the War Veterans' Allowance Act, 1930, clauses 1 and 2. The point I want to make is that in this country it is not necessary that he must have served in a theatre of war, or that he has been wounded, but if he makes application to the GWVA they must take up his case in conjunction with the NPA with the Department of Public Health and Welfare, which treats the case on its merits. That is why I objected to there being no parallel.

Mr. Chairman Your point is that there are certain conditions precedent in Canada which have to be got over, which do not apply in Newfoundland at all?

Mr. Hollett Yes.

Mr. Chairman For example, you make the point that he must have served 15 months overseas, or must have been wounded, before he could qualify?

Mr. Hollett Yes.

Mr. Chairman But here, without reference to the fact of whether he served overseas or not, whether he lost a limb or not, pensions may and have been granted where his case has been sponsored by the GWVA and the NPA, as the case may be.