

any pension, but if he dies at the end of the seventh year, his dependents are pensioned.

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: No, no; at any time within the seven years.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: Oh, he must have died within the seven years? Well, it just shows the position we were in, so far as evidence was concerned. At any rate, under the English law and practice, that class of men, as I understand, does not himself get a pension, but if he happens to die within seven years, his dependents will. On the other hand, so far as the United States is concerned, the most that we could gather from evidence given by one of the chief officers of the Pension Bureau—Dr. Rogers, was it not?—was to the effect that they stretched their law and regulations to such an extent as to give pensions to dependents in some of these classes.

Hon. Mr. BEIQUE: Not in some of these classes, but in some cases.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: Yes, in certain cases. That is the way I understand the evidence. You must remember, honourable gentlemen, this question was thrown at us at a very late stage. I would have liked to have had another three weeks to examine it. For the past four or five days we have worked night and day in order to get at the bottom of the question. So far as we can learn, the practice of the United States as regards the dependents of men of that class, that is, men whose injuries were not attributable to service, is to stretch their laws and regulations so as to make provision for individual cases, or certain kinds of cases.

What do we say in our report? Read our report. We have not committed ourselves one way or the other as regards this principle. We are not asking Parliament to commit itself. We simply say that at this time we should hesitate to write this permanently in our law. All those other countries have thoroughly considered and thoroughly discussed the principles upon which pension law should be based. Surely it cannot be said by anybody, even the honourable gentlemen who have spoken, that the Parliament of Canada has shown any disposition whatever to do anything but justice to our returned men. You have only to read the schedule in our report, which shows clearly that in regard to pensions Canada has gone further than any other country in the world.

Hon. Mr. BEIQUE: Much further.

Hon. Mr. GIRROIR: It is to our credit.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: I do not think we should allow a question of sentiment to carry us away at this time. All our Committee asks is that Parliament should pause and think, and that it should get exact and reliable evidence upon which to base its judgment. Such evidence we have not at the present time. I think we are asking for only what is right.

Hon. Mr. SCHAFFNER: What will be the result of that?

Hon. Mr. CALDER: We simply ask that the matter be allowed to stand for one year, until Parliament is placed in possession of the evidence and information which we think it should have.

Hon. Mr. GIRROIR: My honourable friend deprecates sentiment in dealing with this matter. May I ask him this question? Was it sentiment or was it cool business that sent our boys overseas?

Hon. Mr. CALDER: That is clearly apart from the question, if I may be allowed to say so.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: This is an Act of Parliament.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: There is a sentiment, and there has always been a sentiment, behind this whole problem, and Parliament has acted on that sentiment. The Parliament of Canada has shown, by great majorities in both Houses, that sentiment has led them a long way in dealing with this question.

Hon. Mr. GIRROIR: Why say that sentiment did not enter into it?

Hon. Mr. CALDER: I do not say that, but I say we should not allow ourselves to be carried away by sentiment alone on this question.

Hon. Mr. GIRROIR: I agree with you there.

Hon. Mr. LYNCH-STANTON: I have listened attentively to what the honourable gentleman has said, it seems to me there is no necessity to make further inquiry into this particular phase of the Bill. The question is entirely one of cost. Everybody admits that there is merit in the proposed legislation. No person that I have heard speak has distinguished between the merits of the case of the man who is killed in the fight and the merits of the case of the man who is killed while on leave. To my mind the one question for us to decide is not what distance other nations have gone in granting pensions, or on what principles