

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I referred to the militia regulations which are made applicable by Order in Council to the North-west Mounted Police.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is there any statute enabling that to be done?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I presume there must be a statute authorizing the Order in Council to be passed.

The PRIME MINISTER. We take an appropriation every year for those pensions, and by Order in Council we provide the scale on which this fund shall be expended.

Mr. CLARKE. While the right hon. gentleman says that cases such as those I have mentioned are specially dealt with by parliament, or the recommendation of an Order in Council, the clause allowed to stand proposes to deal with them in an arbitrary way. If an officer is obliged to quit the force before a pension can be granted him the Governor in Council may grant him a gratuity of three months pay for every two years he has served. If he has not served the full number of years, he should be entitled to a reasonable pension for the services he has rendered.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. If you allow those to participate who have served shorter terms the scheme will not be self-supporting. There is no doubt we have the power, if we wish, to provide that every mounted policeman who is hurt, shall receive a pension, whether he has been only a short time or a long time in the service. But we have never gone so far, I believe, as to make a general pension applying to the militia or to the mounted police. There have been difficulties in the way. This applies to officers.

The PRIME MINISTER. There is a Pension Act for the men which has been on the statute-book for a long time.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. At all events this applies only to the officers. If we desire to subscribe what is necessary to an enlargement of the scope of any existing scheme, let us do it with our eyes open, let us have some sort of calculation to show what we are to be asked for. The right hon. leader of the government should be ready to say that he is prepared to ask the Minister of Finance for what is necessary.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If I regarded the Bill as my hon. friend from South Norfolk (Hon. Mr. Tisdale) does, I could not vote for it, for we have no information to indicate that the scheme will be self-supporting. The right hon. leader of the government has not brought down a line or a figure to show that the contributions provided for will make the scheme self-sustaining. I am not regarding it in that light at all, but

rather in this way—though it may impose some burden upon the country, and very likely will, it is right and proper to make some provisions for these men and at the same time to make them contribute in as fair and reasonable a way as possible towards the support of the fund. I agree with the hon. member for South Norfolk that if the scheme is to be dealt with as a self-supporting scheme we should have the further information he has referred to.

Mr. OLIVER. I understood the Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) to say that those receiving injuries in action were provided for under the Militia Act. There have been many injuries received by members of the mounted police force in the discharge of their duties which could hardly be characterized as injuries received in action. So I think it is necessary, if the idea I have is to be met, that there should be provision in this Act to meet the case of those so injured. It seems to me rather strange that an officer who, we will suppose, has successfully dodged danger for twenty or twenty-five years should get a pension, while the dependent relatives of an officer who, in the first years of his term, serves his country by sacrificing life or limb receives nothing. That is surely an unfair proposition, and, what is more, is not in the interests of efficient service, which is the chief purpose to be attained by all such measures as this.

Mr. CLARKE. I understand that the right hon. gentleman (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) allows clause 5 to stand for further consideration. I would ask that clause 8 be treated in the same way.

The PRIME MINISTER. Stand.

Section allowed to stand.

On section 10,

Mr. OLIVER. Is this amount payable yearly?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). For life?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes.

On section 11,

Mr. OLIVER. Is this also a yearly payment?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes.

On section 15,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In the fortieth line appears the date 'the thirteenth day of June.' I do not see the significance of the 'thirteenth.' Is this not a misprint for the 'thirtieth' day of June?

The PRIME MINISTER. I suppose that this is a misprint for 'thirtieth.'