

Rt. Hon. Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT—My hon. friend in his remarks did not exactly meet the question which was put. We were agreed that we would raise no objection to the case of gentlemen who, like the hon. member from Hastings, had been actually called out and served, but men who were simply warned to hold themselves in readiness and never left their homes or lost a day's work, to pay them \$100 is a very questionable proceeding indeed, and the government ought to be in a position to tell us, because a million dollars is involved in this matter.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—I do not think that class of person would come within the meaning of the Act. It simply provides for those who were regularly enrolled, or enlisted in and served, with any militia corps called out for active service.

Rt. Hon. Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT—I would like to know exactly what these words mean. If by called out he means they were actually under canvas or actually held in their own place doing duty, that would be sufficient. But called out in a good many cases would simply mean that they were notified to hold themselves in readiness.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—Where would you draw the line in distinction?

Rt. Hon. Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT—I would draw the line here. I think wherever a regiment or company had been absolutely or actually put under marching orders in terms, even if they did not go to the front, I am willing to recognize that, and of course a fortiori in the case mentioned by my hon. friend wherever they had left their homes and gone on service in various parts of the country. That is a perfectly legitimate thing to be recognized. I do not know whether the Bill can be amended in this Chamber; if it could I would press my hon. friend to try and make a clear line of deviation between those that might be entitled to the \$100 and those who will not be entitled to it. Because if it is undefined, we may have a repetition of what is going on in the United States. Veterans of the war of 1860 and 1865 seem to go on increasing, al-

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED.

though we are 50 years past that time. There is another principle there which seems to be a very doubtful one. There are those who have died since 1866, and those who have survived. It seems that the government holds that life is a bad thing, because it gives compensation to those who have continued to live for the past 45 years, and gives nothing to the heirs of those who have died, and this money is not distributed to the widows and children of those who have not the good fortune to live. I would rather have taken care of the widows and children than those who have the advantage, in spite of the fact that for a week or two their ambitions were raised to the point of thinking they would perhaps be called to the front and are now being given \$100 after fifty years.

Hon. Mr. POWER. It has occurred to me that it was possible, inasmuch as the language of this Bill leaves the beneficiaries a little doubtful, the department or the government might make regulations under this Bill so as to prevent its provisions from being abused. I think the minister, with the approval of the government, might undertake to define what active service means, and in that way would be able to exclude persons who really have no substantial claim.

Hon. Mr. WATSON—I would like to say a word for the class of people who probably would not come under this list. I refer to a few people who repelled the Fenian Raid invasion in Manitoba in 1869 and 1870, and I certainly think that these earlier settlers, the pioneers who turned out and put themselves under arms, although they did not belong to any enrolled militia ought certainly to receive as much consideration as the enrolled militia, because the enrolled militia were not in the district, and could not be called out to defend their country. The early settlers in Manitoba who turned out to repel the Fenian invasion should receive some consideration.

Hon. Mr. DANIEL—I do not think any difficulty will be experienced as to who are entitled to this \$100. There must be in