

Hon. Mr. CALDER: There is one phase of the discussion that we should get quite clear, and that is the question of expense. As I said, so far as that is concerned, it does not bother me very much. But the law was changed in 1920. Certain of those soldiers who received injuries not due to service have died; but if we say we should go back and restore that law, immediately there is \$450,000 to be paid on that account to their dependants.

Hon. Mr. McMEANS: What of that?

Hon. Mr. CALDER: The House does not understand the financial position, and I want to make it clear. I say there is \$450,000 to be paid on that account.

Hon. Mr. MURPHY: That we owe the widows and orphans.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: No, not that we owe them. The existing law has been carried out. During the present fiscal year it is estimated that the liability will be \$100,000 in addition to the \$450,000, and that next year and succeeding years up to 20 or 25 years there will be an increasing amount each year. It is estimated that in the tenth year the amount to be voted by Parliament will be \$1,000,000 and in the twentieth year \$2,000,000, and at the end of twenty-five years the total amount that will have been expended on this account will be \$32,000,000.

Hon. Mr. TURRIFF: Will that be the end of it?

Hon. Mr. CALDER: Practically.

Hon. Mr. ROBERTSON: I think that perhaps every honourable member in this House has distinct views on this question. I listened to some of the evidence submitted when the Committee was in session, and the difficulty that I cannot overcome is that if a soldier while on leave in London, for example, meets with an accident, whether through his own carelessness or not, he is given a pension, but when he dies his dependants are not given a pension. In my opinion, if there is to be any discrimination between accidents while off active service and on active service, the discrimination should be against the man himself, and not against his dependants. If a soldier met with an accident that disabled him, either by injury in battle or while travelling in the streets of London, his wife and children should be entitled to a pension, providing he was injured while on his country's service, though not actually on duty at the moment. I cannot agree with the report of the Committee in this regard, and must of necessity vote against it, although

I do agree with some of the other recommendations made by the Committee in other matters.

Hon. Mr. TURRIFF: If the report of the Committee was such that we either had to vote for the Bill or throw it out, my inclination, after listening to the evidence, would be to support the Bill; but the report does not propose to throw the Bill out altogether. The Committee feel that this subject is one on which they have not had sufficient time or full information, and all they are asking for is that this particular question be left over for one year.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: That is all.

Hon. Mr. TURRIFF: I would like to point out that we have an example before us in the American pensions. I do not suppose a greater scandal ever occurred in this country or the United States than that relating to their pensions. They started in moderately, but though the war ended in 1865 the American Government is paying out today to the dependents of soldiers who were killed or wounded in the war from 1862 to 1865 more than they paid when the war closed. Now, are we in danger of running into something of that kind? We are facing one increase after another all the time, and our pension bill is rising, and rising very high. I would be the last to suggest that we should not deal fairly and liberally with those who suffered during the war, but the fact remains that we have been more liberal with them than any country on earth has been with its soldiers; probably 50 per cent more liberal than the United States, 50 per cent more than Great Britain, and double and treble as much as some other nations.

Hon. G. V. WHITE: Does the honourable member think we have been too liberal with them?

Hon. Mr. PARDEE: That is not the point.

Hon. M. TURRIFF: It is not whether we have been too liberal or not, but it is whether it is the proper thing to pass this legislation that is going to put an extra cost of \$32,000,000 on the country, without getting all the information we should have. I think there would be no injury to anybody if this matter were left over till next Session, when we could get all the information that could be brought, and take up both sides of the question, and see at that time what is the proper thing to do.

Hon. Mr. GORDON: Can the honourable gentleman assure us that none of those de-