

Hon. Mr. BEIQUE: I know that I was a member of the Committee, because I was present when the Committee was appointed and my name was mentioned. I followed the sittings of the Committee with as much attention as I was capable of giving, and I must say that as far as I am concerned, it is not a question of wording. I am satisfied with the wording upon which the report of the Committee was based. If it were a question of wording, I would try to find a way of expressing what was intended.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: Honourable gentlemen, I desire to say just a word or two in reference to the attitude of the Committee on this legislation. I think I have been a member of every Committee, either of the Commons or the Senate, dealing with pension legislation and other legislation relating to returned soldiers, and I think I may say without contradiction that the attitude of the great majority of the members of those committees has been absolutely sympathetic. There has been an endeavour at all times to do the right thing for returned soldiers. I think I may say also that there has been an utter lack of what might be called partisanship in dealing with this problem.

The honourable member for New Westminster (Hon. Mr. Taylor) to-day invites the Leader of the Government to show a bold front, to indicate leadership. Well, if that means anything, it means that he should take a purely partisan view of this situation, and should endeavour to force through this House a measure that may not meet with the approval of the majority. I take it that the Senate sits as a reviewing body, to review legislation seriously and without partisanship, and that we should approach this legislation, as we should all legislation, and deal with it in a non-partisan way. So far as I can remember, that has always been our attitude in the past, and, because this class of legislation will come before us many times in the future, I trust that will continue to be the attitude of the Senate.

One other point. The main clause of this Bill deals with a principle that has stood on our Statute Book since 1916. I am sure there is no doubt in the minds of any member of this House that it is our desire, and the desire of Parliament, that the widow should receive a pension if conditions can be set around the law that will prevent abuses. That is the whole question. We all know what has taken place in the United States, where not only

hundreds of people, but thousands, have been pensioned who never should have been pensioned.

We are asked to-day to write in our law a new principle that will open the door to all sorts of abuses. In that sense we have had difficulty, as has been said, in finding a formula. My honourable friend (Hon. Mr. Taylor) thinks it should be very easy. Well, it is not. I would like him to try it. In the House of Commons they tried not only for many days, but for many weeks, and they finally had to admit that they had made a failure. Weeks afterwards they came to us with another suggestion, which we found equally to fail; then we had a suggestion from a third party, and that also was found to be lacking. Our difficulty is to find language upon which we can base a principle without permitting an abuse that would cost this country many hundreds of thousands if not millions of dollars. There is no objection to sending the Bill back to Committee. Let us try it again. I doubt very much whether we will get over the difficulty, but in any event there are other clauses that require our attention, and upon which we can perhaps agree.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: I should like to add the name of Senator Beique to that Committee, because he was on the other Committee which dealt with the Insurance Bill. It was due to oversight that his name was left off.

Hon. W. B. ROSS: I would suggest that the name of Senator Taylor also be added.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: I join with my honourable friend in suggesting that the name of the honourable gentleman from New Westminster (Hon. Mr. Taylor) be added to the Committee.

The motion of Hon. Mr. Dandurand, amended as suggested, was agreed to.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST AND SECOND READINGS

Bill 57, an Act respecting the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway Company.—Hon. Mr. Griesbach.

Bill 71, an Act to incorporate the St. Lawrence River Bridge Company.—Hon. Mr. Hardy.

The Senate adjourned until to-morrow at 3 p.m.