

tive men in each province who would give their services to this organization, and be the means of communication in regard to particular cases that might arise in each province. I apprehend that, on account of the number of men who are going, the necessity for this fund will be very much greater and its operations far more extensive than the case in respect of the fund which was established at the time of the South African war. It certainly would be desirable and absolutely necessary that those of us who come from the far-away provinces, either in the East or in the West, should have some active, well-known representative on the administrative body, so that we might have some means of communication on behalf of the people who come from our respective provinces. Some one suggested that members of Parliament and senators might be ex-officio members of the corporation. I am not prepared to say that I agree absolutely with that suggestion.

I do think that there ought to be local recognition of men from the various provinces in order that this plan may work out satisfactorily. As a matter of course, the names of Mr. J. K. L. Ross and Mr. John C. Eaton whose subscriptions already have been of such a magnificent character, should be included in the list of incorporators; but, as we are all anxious to have this scheme put on a proper basis, the personnel of the incorporators, the names set out in section 2 of the people who are to compose the corporation, should be extended in some degree in order to attain the object which has been suggested by my hon. friend.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: This Bill, as has been stated by the Minister of Public Works, is almost a reproduction of the Act passed in 1901, at the time of the South African war. The objection was taken at that time which has just been stated by my hon. friend from Queens and Sunbury (Mr. H. H. McLean), that in that respect the Bill had not given satisfaction in the section of the country which he represents. And there is force in his objection. I can see, however, that at this stage, as we expect to prorogue this afternoon, it is perhaps difficult to make any suggestion which can be embodied in the present Bill. I suggest to my hon. friend that he take into consideration the suggestion of the hon. member for Queens and Sunbury, and perhaps at the next session we might amend the Bill in that direction.

Mr. ROGERS: There is provision in section 14 for the addition of names to the corporation. With that in view we shall be able to meet the suggestion of the hon. gentleman opposite of the addition of the names of any persons whom it is desirable to add.

Section agreed to.

On section 3—objects:

Mr. McKENZIE: The word 'relatives' of the absentees might be a cause of worry. Parties might require assistance who are not relatives. The word 'relatives' is not defined in the Bill. In the province from which I come there has been difficulty in assisting parties who deserved assistance, because they were not technically relatives, as in the case of a man who has an adopted son.

Mr. ROGERS: That point engaged the attention of those who had charge of the preparation of the Bill. The word 'dependents,' which was used in the Bill of 1901, caused a great deal of trouble, according to those who had the practical administration of the fund. The word 'relatives' seemed to cover as wide a range as was desirable.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: An hon. gentleman behind me suggests that it should read 'relatives by birth or adoption.'

Mr. McKENZIE: In Nova Scotia we have found that under the Workmen's Compensation Act the person who takes the place of a father, and brings up a son, can not claim anything, as he is not a relative.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I should not imagine that there would be a great many of such cases, and I would be inclined to think that possibly they might be covered by this wording. In any case, if occasion were found, it would be a very simple matter to amend the Act to cover deserving cases.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: The point raised by the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) is not a large point, but it is a very cogent point, and I think we ought to have assurance from some legal member of the Government that the specific case would be covered by the term 'relative.' Otherwise the word 'relative' is not sufficient.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think it might pass in the present form, as it has been recommended by the committee in that