

allows it to fail because of indifference on the part of the Government, the matter should be made very plain, so that the responsibility may lie where it belongs.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: I have no objection to answering my honourable friend, and I think I can do so in the spirit in which my remarks were couched when the report of the Committee came before this Chamber. The various clauses of the Bill had been framed and agreed upon by a Committee of the House of Commons which had held 47 sittings. Its conclusions on certain clauses, I suppose, though I have no special knowledge, were the result of compromise for the purpose of bringing about unanimity. The Government transformed the Committee's unanimous report into a Bill, which, perhaps by agreement, was passed by the Commons without much discussion, and the Bill came here. I intended, as representing the Government, to give as much leeway to the Senate as the Government gave the Commons, in view of the whole matter having been referred to a Committee of the Commons.

I do not know what is in the mind of my honourable friend, or whether he desires that on such a technical matter I should ask the loyal support of all the members sitting on this side, and stand by the clauses without dotting an i or crossing a t. My honourable friend in his remarks of last week expressed surprise at the Senate Committee having been unable to find a formula which would conform with the desires of many honourable members of the Senate. As a matter of fact no vote was taken on the question of altering the underlying principle of the Pension Bill. There were expressions of opinion in the Committee. My honourable friend was somewhat severe on the Senate Committee and on the Senate for hesitating to try to find a formula of words. I should have pointed out to him that the House of Commons Committee, which was quite a large one, composed of serious men, and which had worked upon this same Bill and the clause in question, produced after 47 sittings a formula which, they practically admitted, was not an ideal one and was perhaps unworkable. My honourable friend, who as a layman has his own judgment to direct him, and who has a wide knowledge of the English language, thought that it was a question of words only. It was rather a question of trying to crystallize in words a very difficult situation for which the House of Commons, after 47 sittings of its Committee, had not succeeded in finding

Hon. Mr. TAYLOR.

a formula. That is perhaps what I should have told my honourable friend in defence of the action of the Senate Committee on that clause.

I intend to treat the Senate with as much consideration as the Commons was treated by my colleagues in the other Chamber. In this respect I repeat what I have just said. This is a highly technical matter, and it is for this reason that, at the suggestion of honourable members of the Senate, I have agreed that we should do again what we did in other circumstances with a similar Bill, and refer the Bill to a Committee. If my suggestion does not meet with the views of the majority of this Chamber, then we will consider the Bill in Committee of the Whole, or consider it here and now.

Hon. Mr. TAYLOR: Honourable gentlemen, may I be permitted? I have no desire to detain the Senate, but I do not think the honourable gentleman has put the matter quite fairly. The Bill is not so very technical in the matters of importance to those whom it was intended to favour, that is, the ex-soldiers of Canada. It is a matter of dollars and cents with them or their widowed dependents. There is very little that is technical about those clauses that were struck out by this Chamber.

Now, if the Government would give a bold lead to the Committee and say that it had no desire that the money grant favoured by the Commons should be reduced in the Senate, and if the honourable leader of the Government so instructed the Committee and this House, I feel that the Senate would not hesitate. I have no authority to speak for the Senate. I speak my own opinion, from my own general knowledge, that the Senate would have no disposition to trim from those soldiers and their dependents any dollars that the Commons is willing to give to them. That is the kind of leadership that I would like to see the Government give the Committee, and the Senate as a body, in connection with this Bill.

Hon. Mr. BEIQUE: Honourable gentlemen, although my name does not appear as that of a member of the Committee—

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: Yes, it does.

Hon. Mr. BEIQUE: No.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: There were two Committees appointed. I would ask that the name of Hon. Mr. Béique be added.