

ing Bill, there are, it seems to me, only two questions: the question of justice and right on the one hand, and the question of cost on the other.

I realize that while I may establish the justice and right of granting certain pensions, the House may decide that it is just and right, although the country cannot afford to do so. I will deal with that question separately. In the meantime, I address myself to the question of justice and right.

I go back to the beginning of things, in a search to ascertain what was the contract between the people of this country and the men who constituted the Expeditionary Force. I shall not look for that contract in any written document, nor in any Act of Parliament. I shall look for it—and I think I shall find it—in the statements of 10,000 recruiting officers, in the statements of public men, in the statements of societies and organizations and newspapers from coast to coast, made in an endeavour to secure men for the Expeditionary Force. It was stated that any man who gave up his civil occupation and joined the Force for the purpose of proceeding overseas would be fully and absolutely protected, not only in himself, but also as to all those dependent upon him. What difference, after all, does it make, now that the war is over, now that it is an episode of the past—what difference does it make whether a man lost his leg in a bus accident in London or lost it on the field? It is more than probable that that man may have been on leave from the trenches in France for eight days—

Hon. Mr. MURPHY: I would like to ask the honourable gentleman a question. Why were not the venereal conditions taken into consideration? I do not know why the position of things as respects venereal diseases was not gone into, because that was as much a war fatality as anything else. Although I had four sons there, they did not belong to that category, but I wanted to hear what the honourable gentleman had to say on it.

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: I think the argument is that a man may escape venereal disease if he wishes to. I was dealing with the contract that existed. I leave it to the judgment of the House whether it was not the fact that all the discussions that took place, and the whole attitude of the people, related to the insurance principle. The people of this country in effect pledged themselves to men who took up military service and went to the war that their dependants would be looked after, as well as themselves. There can be no escape from that by any man who

had anything to do with the war, either in Canada or elsewhere. Now we have the Act of 1920, which alters the principle of the Act of 1919. Parliament having accepted the principle and having carried out the contract in that Act, the Act of 1920 breaks the contract.

Hon. Mr. LYNCH-STAUNTON: What was the justification alleged for the Act of 1920?

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: What I think happened was this. I think the amendment was slipped in, and it passed without observation—because all the members of Parliament and the members of this House are continually learning more about this Pension Act. Five or six days ago it would have been possible to make many statements to our Committee which could not have been made five days later. If any of us feel now that we failed to ask any questions in Committee that we should have asked, it was because we did not know of them. I do not know how this amendment got in, and perhaps it is not germane to the discussion how it got in, but the fact is it got in, and it constitutes a breach of contract.

Let me pass from that for a moment to discuss the unwisdom, shall I say, and the unfairness, of endeavouring to make a distinction between the two sorts of injured men and their dependants. Suppose a man is injured in a bus accident in London when on leave from the trenches. Now, leave to England or some other place was as essential a part of a soldier's life as was his food and his clothing; it was as important to his morale that he should leave the trenches for a period as that he should have food and be clothed and properly housed. Those of us who were there know that absolutely, and honourable gentlemen who have imagination will know that it must be so.

Hon. Mr. GIRROIR: Was the soldier on leave still under pay?

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: Oh, yes. The man was sent to England or elsewhere in order to recuperate him and build up his health; yet if he suffered an accident under those conditions we say his accident is not attributable to military service as such, and consequently, under the Act of 1920, although he may receive a pension for his injury, his dependants do not receive a pension.

Hon. Mr. LYNCH-STAUNTON: Take the case of a man who was in the trenches and had to walk back to a resting camp, say