

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: Yes, but it allows a renewed application if new evidence is found.

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE E. FOSTER: That is reasonable, I think, to a very large extent. We all know the history of pension legislation in the United States. Long after the war was over, and when all the guns had rusted into powder, new applications were still coming in and enlargements being made. Sixty years after the war the pension bill of the United States was larger than it had been at any preceding time.

If this Bill applies only to the hearing of new evidence, there is ground for it. There are various reasons why evidence sometimes cannot be obtained. But we should guard very closely—and I believe our military men are in unison on this—against enlarging the scope of applications for pension.

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: This Bill has two aspects. One is, to all intents and purposes, the right of the Board of Appeal to hear a new appeal; the other is the extension of time.

To deal with the first. The law governing the Board of Appeal was that the decision of the Board, when given, should be final, and the appeal was not afterwards submitted to the Board of Pension Commissioners. But while the decision of the Board of Appeal was final, there was no finality at all in the application to the Board of Pension Commissioners. As a consequence, this situation might result: a man might apply for a pension, submit his evidence, get an adverse decision, be dissatisfied, and appeal to the Appeal Board, who might confirm the decision. So far as the Appeal Board was concerned, that man was done; but so far as the Board of Pension Commissioners was concerned, he was not. He might get fresh evidence and submit it to the Board of Pension Commissioners, and it was their duty to hear it. They might then say, "This new evidence convinces us that this man should have a pension," but the Board of Appeal had previously ruled that he could not be pensioned. This created an absurd situation. This section of the Bill is designed to cover that feature.

The extension of time is another matter. Under the Pension Act a man who was hospitalized for disability while in the service has a claim, continuing throughout his lifetime, to a pension with respect to that particular disability. Let that be clear. If he was hospitalized for a lung condition—"T.B.," for instance—so long as he lives that hospitalization constitutes a continuing application which is not governed by any statute of limitation. But with respect to any dis-

ability which a man might develop in after life and for which he was not hospitalized while in the service, we legislated some years ago to provide that the application must be made within the period of seven years from the time of demobilization. That time, I think, expired in September of last year, and this amendment extends it for two years. No new grounds or new rights are created; the time is extended, that is all.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: The right honourable gentleman (Right Hon. Sir George E. Foster) has spoken of the experience of the United States in the matter of pensions. I have heard the same warning uttered in this Chamber within the last few years. I may say that I attended the meetings of the Senate Committee when the amendments to the Act came under review, and I want to bear testimony to the spirit of loyalty and fair play shown by the gallant soldiers that we have with us in this Chamber, in approaching the matter. They were always desirous of doing the right thing by the soldier, but stopped at the point beyond which they thought an undue advantage would be given. I may be for only a short space of time in this Chamber myself, but I trust that, should any pressure come from the House of Commons—for one must not forget that if there is any pressure it will come from the members of that House, who have to look for popular support—that in the general interest of Canada we may rely upon the judgment of the soldiers who so gallantly led to battle the very men who may be appealing for a revision of the pension law.

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE E. FOSTER: Not only was there an extension of grounds in the United States, but there grew up in the Senate, if not in the representative branch of Congress itself, what was really a system of log-rolling, by which individual pension bills were introduced, and under which one Senator would say to another: "You support my bill and I will support yours." This was acknowledged everywhere in the United States to have become a very gross scandal. I am satisfied that we are quite safe from that situation in this assembly.

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: May I just touch upon that? Entirely apart from the natural fondness of the people of the United States for politics, the scandal which grew up there was largely if not wholly, attributable to the fact that their whole scheme of enlistment and records was haphazard, almost nonexistent. The result was that after the war there were no documents at all concerning a man, and he