

amount, whether he has paid it or not. Is that the object of the Bill?

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: If my honourable friend would read the clause, he would see. Perhaps it would be well to have the Bill put down for second reading at the next sitting of the House.

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE E. FOSTER: Surely if anything in the wide world could reduce this House to a mere rubber stamp it would be the pushing through of this Bill in its present condition.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: I think it is very desirable that we should know what the aggregate reduction will be. Of course, it will involve practically the loss of that amount. My honourable friend might ascertain at the same time on what principle we are proceeding in reducing the indebtedness to soldier settlers by the amounts mentioned in the Bill, because I presume these figures are applicable to all cases.

Hon. Mr. GILLIS: And we should know the number of settlers who will benefit by this reduction.

Hon. Mr. McLENNAN: There is another point, too: will there be a provision for men who have paid in full? I understand that a considerable number of men made all their payments; do they get the reduction?

Hon. Mr. TURRIFF: I would like to point out that while many of the soldier settlers got land that is valued very high, so that a reduction in their cases is probably in order, many others got their land at a very reasonable price, and have made a success of their venture. It does not seem reasonable that they should get a 40 per cent reduction, the same as the men who were led into paying double the value of their land.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: I will get the necessary data for the next sitting.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: When the information comes down we can discuss it more intelligently.

Hon. Mr. POPE: That Bill does not apply to land, but to stock.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: It deals with live stock only.

Hon. Mr. REID: I think this Bill, and probably 20 others, should have been introduced in this House first, and thus have given the Senate some work to do. We might have gone into this Bill and perhaps put it into better shape. It has been introduced in the Commons within 48 hours of prorogation.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: My honourable friend is in error. This Bill could not be introduced in the Senate; it must be initiated in the House of Commons.

Hon. Mr. REID: If it is a Money Bill; but there are a great many Bills that could have been introduced in this House, and I think we should insist next Session on that being done.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: I move that the second reading of this Bill be postponed until the next sitting.

The motion was agreed to.

CANADA TEMPERANCE BILL

FIRST READING

Bill 209, an Act to amend the Canada Temperance Act.—Hon. Mr. Dandurand.

Hon. Mr. POPE: Is that the Bill that has been in this House two or three times?

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: I have an impression that it is. I think it was dealt with a couple of times, but I am not sure. I think it is an old friend, but I do not know if it is in the same terms. I shall be able to give an answer to my honourable friend when it comes up for second reading.

BOARD OF AUDIT BILL

FIRST READING

Bill 223, an Act to constitute a Board of Audit.—Hon. Mr. Dandurand.

PENSION BILL

CERTAIN SENATE AMENDMENTS DISAGREED TO BY HOUSE OF COMMONS

The Hon. The SPEAKER presented the following message from the House of Commons:

That a Message be sent to the Senate to acquaint Their Honours that this House hath agreed to the second, fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth, tenth, eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth, fifteenth, eighteenth and nineteenth of their amendments to the Bill No. 70, an Act to amend the Pension Act, and hath disagreed to the first amendment for the following reasons:

In section 1, the words "was attributable to or" should not be deleted as it is claimed a disability may make its appearance long after discharge and the words "incurred during military service" if they are the only ones left may lead to narrower an interpretation.

And hath disagreed to their third and fourteenth amendments for the following reasons:

Sections 3 and 9 should be reinstated: they provide for payment of pension to dependents upon the death of pensioners in classes 1 to 5 regardless of whether the death is a result of military service or not. It is represented that high disability pensioners are less than others in a position to provide in advance for their dependents.

And hath also disagreed to their sixteenth and seventeenth amendments for the following reasons: