

widow is told that there is no pension whatever for her because she married him after the first appearance of the tuberculosis. Is that the limit to which the Senate is willing to go in view of the ample provision made by the Bill sent to us from the House of Commons?

I referred to what happened yesterday in the Committee—the overtures made to us, the acceptance of which would have perfectly satisfied the House of Commons. They were made by the Chairman of the Pension Committee there, who was presumed to speak on behalf of the Government, and who was also understood to speak on behalf of the other Party there, the House of Commons being practically unanimous on the subject. As the honourable gentleman from Moose Jaw (Hon. Mr. Calder) has said, the Chairman of the Board, Col. Thompson, was asked to draft another section. The reason he was asked to draft it was because the Committee divided on the section as offered by the House of Commons—they divided evenly, 50 per cent of the Committee being for agreeing, and the other 50 per cent being contrary—and the unexpected entry of a gentleman who had not been in previously gave the one vote upon which the House of Commons provision was lost. Then it was that the Chairman of the Board was asked to present a draft, which resulted in this gold brick, if I may use the term without disrespect.

Another thing happened in the Committee this morning which I think should be mentioned. We hear very often that the difficulty in the way of proper provision for soldiers' dependents is the Conservative Senate. I do not think the imputation on the Senate is fair; but we do hear over and over again that the Senate did thus and so. Now, if we adopt this report, I would like to have it made plain that this action is not primarily the action of the Conservative Senate, because no less a person than the Minister of National Defence, the guardian-in-chief of the soldiers' interests in Canada, appeared before our Committee this morning and said that the provision now before us had his approval; and, of course, having his approval, it has the approval of the Government.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: If the honourable gentleman would allow me, I think it only fair to the Minister of National Defence that I should make a statement. When Colonel Ralston was asked to make a statement as to what he thought of this, he made it quite clear that he was not speaking as a Minister of the Crown, but only in his individual capacity, because everyone can understand

that without full consideration of the measure with his colleagues, and unless the Government itself took action on the matter, he could not speak otherwise. Therefore it is scarcely proper to say that any expression he gave vent to in the Committee this morning was on behalf of the Government.

Hon. Mr. TAYLOR: I do not think I said that.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: You said he was speaking with full authority.

Hon. Mr. TAYLOR: I am obliged to the honourable gentleman for his other lecture. I was there and heard what was said, and the main fact is that a gentleman who is a Minister of the Crown, and the guardian in the Cabinet of the interests of the soldiers, a man who is in the Cabinet because he is supposed to have the absolute confidence of the soldiers—and I have no contradiction to offer to that—accepted in the Committee this morning the proposal that is now before us. My point is that, the case being so, it should not be put about in the country or here that anything that happens to this Bill to-day is the evil work of the Conservative Senate.

Hon. W. A. GRIESBACH: Honourable gentlemen, just a few observations in defence of the work of the Committee, and dealing with what has just been said by the honourable gentleman from New Westminster (Hon. Mr. Taylor) on the two clauses to which he has referred.

On the clause regarding aggravation the statement of the Committee is that under existing law there is no deduction on account of pre-enlistment condition with respect to those who served in a theatre of war.

Hon. Mr. TAYLOR: Where is that law?

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: I am about to read it. I shall read now from the Pension Act itself, section 11, subsection (b):

No deduction shall be made from the degree of actual disability of any member of the forces who has served in a theatre of actual war on account of any disability or disabling condition which existed in him at the time at which he became a member of the forces; but no pension shall be paid for a disability or disabling condition which at such time was wilfully concealed, was obvious, was not of a nature to cause rejection from service, or was a congenital defect.

These words in the conclusion of the paragraph are words which do not really affect the situation at all.

Hon. Mr. TAYLOR: But—if the honourable gentleman will permit me—that is not the case I mentioned.