

they have acted, but whether or not, when we have ascertained the cost—and I assume that the honourable gentleman from Edmonton (Hon. Mr. Griesbach) has given us the correct total—whether or not it is too great a burden for us to bear. Granting the merit, the only question remaining is that of cost.

Now, if the Committee fought for a year, they would get no further enlightenment on that part of the question than they have to-day, and it does seem to me that if we are not afraid to place on the Statute Book an amendment increasing the pension cost to this country by the amount which has been stated to us as the ultimate liability, we should vote for the Bill as it stood.

Hon. Mr. TAYLOR: Honourable gentlemen, I think it is true that the pension scale in Canada is the most liberal paid anywhere, but what satisfaction is that to the widows and orphans of the men whose pensions were cut off by the legislation of 1920? The cost is stated to be \$100,000 a year. As to the \$2,500,000 in 25 years, I am very sceptical. I have seen no authority for that estimate. To my mind it cuts no figure whatever. Twenty-five years is a long time and we shall have many, many opportunities of revising our legislation between now and the end of that period. As I see it, the question is this. There is at present a cost of \$100,000 a year being borne by the widows and orphans of the men who served this country when we needed the service of real men. We have a report of a Committee that has given a great deal of attention to this subject, recommending to us as a nation to assume that \$100,000 that these widows and orphans are now bearing. For my part, I desire to support the recommendation of that report and to oppose any suggestion that because of timidity we should further suspend a measure of justice to those widows and orphans.

Hon. GEORGE GORDON: Honourable gentlemen, I cannot understand at all why there should be any distinction between the dependent of the soldier killed at the front and the dependent of the soldier who, having been at the front and become exhausted, has been sent back to Paris or elsewhere to rest, and is killed while on leave. Without that rest, the soldier would be of no further use. Perhaps after a rest of three or four weeks he is able to go back to the front again. As I understand, if anything happens to the soldier while on leave, his dependents are treated differently from those of the soldier whose death is attributable to service. It seems to me that this is one of the most

ridiculous propositions that has ever been put before this House, namely, to cut off the dependents of that man and treat them differently from the dependents of the man who was killed at the front.

The next thing to be considered, we are told, is the matter of cost. We are told that it will take \$100,000 a year to place these men or their dependents in the position in which they ought to be placed.

Hon. W. B. ROSS: That is not so. The expenditure is increased at the rate of \$100,000 a year.

Hon. Mr. GORDON: I know it is an increase of \$100,000 a year. As a citizen of Canada, I would be ashamed if I were unwilling to shoulder my share of the cost. I hope that this Senate will put the Bill through in such a form that justice will be done to these people.

Hon. Mr. DANIEL: Honourable gentlemen, I quite agree that the Committee are entitled to a great deal of thanks for the time and trouble they have taken in order to bring in this report but, as to this particular amendment, I must say that I cannot support it. I think the dependents of a soldier, a man who was enlisted for the war, whether his death occurred right at the front or during a period of leave, ought all to be treated on the same basis. So far as the dependents are concerned—and this question refers only to the dependents—it appears to me that it makes no difference whatever whether the injury or death occurred in the trenches, or whether it occurred when the man was on leave. I think that we as a people should take care in every possible way of the dependents of soldiers who have died or become disabled in the discharge of their duty while under enlistment and in uniform, whether they happened to be in the trenches or on leave.

The very case mentioned in the report is one that convinced me that I ought to vote against the amendment. Let me state the instance. A man on leave in London was injured in a street accident. His injury occurred on service, but is not attributable to service. Now, that man, to my way of thinking, is just as much entitled to his pension, supposing he were run over by an auto, or something of that sort; he is on service, he is on duty; he has dependants, his wife and family. Surely the right is just as great in that case in regard to his dependants as if he had been actually killed or disabled in the trenches. That is my view of it, and I shall not be able to support that amendment.

Hon. Mr. LYNCH-STAUNTON.