

both present and future, to economize in other lines and to develop our resources in every way possible in order that we may pay a just debt to those who saved us from the slavery of the Germans.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: We have under consideration at the present time section 3 of the Bill, which, without question is the most important part of all these Bills, and the one, possibly, that involves the largest expenditure. When you come to take into consideration the amount of money involved, I think I may say that, so far as the Committee is concerned, and, if I am not much mistaken, so far as the great majority of the members of this House are concerned, it is not worrying us very much, because, after all, it is not very great.

I ask that this body do not too hastily come to a conclusion as to what should be done with this section. I will go further than that, and say that, outside the members of the Committee, who have for four or five days wrestled with this question in all its bearings, I doubt very much if many members of the Senate clearly understand what it means; and I would ask that we be not carried away simply by sentimental appeals and that sort of thing. We should clearly understand exactly what we are doing, and why we are doing it.

It is quite true that in 1919 the Parliament of Canada gave to a certain class of dependents the right of pensions; but subsequently, one year afterwards, the other Chamber appointed a Committee, and that Committee wrestled with this question day in and day out, along with other questions, for weeks, and finally came to the conclusion that the decision which Parliament had previously given—should be reversed. Am I stating the position fairly? I say that in the year 1920 a Parliamentary Committee was appointed in another place for the purpose of considering this question which we are now trying to settle in an hour's debate, many of us not knowing the facts at all; and I say that after full deliberation in the other House the conclusion was reached that the pensionability right that had been given previously, and perhaps without due consideration at the time, should be taken away.

The problem came before the Committee of the Senate, and, so far as I am concerned, I regret very much that we had not a great deal more time in which to consider all the questions that are raised by these three

Hon. Mr. TURGEON.

Bills. I consider it unfortunate indeed. I do not blame anybody. The Ralston Commission's Report came down late. Parliament had not these Reports before it. But I say it is unfortunate that in dealing with these various problems, which are exceedingly technical and complicated, these reports did not come down to us, and that the members of the other House had not the fullest opportunity to examine every phase of the propositions, from top to bottom, in order to understand their nature and effect.

The position is very simple, and I would like to state it in such a way that every member of the House may understand what is the real problem before us;—and I will not state it in the language of the Bills, because that is rather technical.

A man who is in the forces goes on furlough or holiday to visit friends up in the North of Scotland. He goes out shooting, and he is shot somewhere in the body by one of his companions, and is injured permanently. The injury is not due to military service in any sense. That man, under our law and practice as they are now, and as they always have been, gets a pension, and it will continue as long as he lives. But, he dies, under the existing law, his dependents will not receive a pension.

Another man goes on furlough to Paris. He is walking along or crossing a street and a motor bus hits him. He is not on military service at all, but is in Paris on leave—enjoying himself, if you like—when he is struck by the motor car. Under our law and practice, that man himself gets a pension as long as he lives, but if he dies his dependents are not pensioned.

Now, the question that is raised by the present section is this: should the dependents of those two men, injured as they were, receive a pension when those men die?

What do we find? We tried to get evidence as to the law prevailing elsewhere, and we find that in Great Britain and in the United States the law is a little different. For example, we find that, if I remember the evidence correctly, in certain classes of those cases in Great Britain the man does not get a pension at all, but if he lives for 20 years and then dies his dependents will be pensioned.

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: Seven years.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: Seven years, is it? For seven years the man himself does not get