

Let me give one of two examples of what actually happened. Take this case—I will not give his regimental number or his name: "Amount applied for, \$5,000. Beneficiary, parents. Application received February 7th, 1922. Application rejected March 12, 1922, on account of serious illness. No dependents". In other words, the parents were not dependent upon this man in any way according to the information in the possession of the Department.

Here is another one: "Amount applied for, \$5,000. Beneficiary, future wife—brother, alternative." That is, if he had no wife, his brother was the alternative. "Application received, November 10, 1922. Application approved, November 11, 1922. Death occurred November 19, 1922. The policy had not been delivered, and claim not admitted in view of the fact that applicant was in hospital when he signed application, evidently in very serious condition, and no one dependent upon him."

We tried to lay down the principle—and I am convinced it was the intent of Parliament at the time the original Act was passed—that insurance would be granted to those men when there were dependents who would get the moneys accruing from the policy in case of death. It was never intended at all that collaterals, more or less disinterested persons, should come in at the last minute and acquire that benefit. That principle is carried out in the amendment of 1922, and we are simply trying to amend this Bill so as to carry out the intent of Parliament as shown in the amending Bill of 1922.

Now let me ask this. If we adopt this clause, who is going to suffer? Is there any reason why Parliament should provide by law that this class of soldier, many of them practically on their death-beds, should get insurance up to \$5,000 and pay it over to someone not dependent on them?

Some Hon. SENATORS: No.

Hon. Mr. GILLIS: I think it is very important that a number of these cases should be put on record so that the public may know exactly what is the situation.

Hon. Mr. SHARPE: There is no doubt in the world that when this law or regulation was brought into effect it was to give insurance, not to the well man who had returned from overseas, but to the man who had been wounded or had taken sick, or something along that line. That was the whole idea from the very first, of giving this insurance, because if a man was in such shape that he

Hon. Mr. CALDER.

could get insurance from an insurance company he would not be bothered with the regulations in connection with the Government insurance. This was for wounded returned soldiers, and I claim, and always have claimed, that every one of those 71 applicants who came properly under the regulations is entitled to his insurance.

My honourable friend from Regina (Hon. Mr. Calder) says that they never came under these regulations. I will admit that the boys out in the country, or the boys in the city, unless they took particular pains to find out, did not know the regulations but I want to tell you that 90 per cent of the boys who went overseas and returned were under the impression that no matter what the condition of a man might be he was entitled to insurance.

Hon. Mr. GIRROIR: May I ask for information? What was the object of this insurance? It was to provide against what, or for what? That seems to be the point.

Hon. Mr. SHARPE: I suppose the object was the same as that of any other insurance. Why does any man insure?

Hon. Mr. LYNCH-STAUTON: Was not the real object the protection of his dependents?

Hon. Mr. SHARPE: I do not think so. I will admit that there has been some fraud in connection with this matter; from what I have heard I do not think there is any doubt about that. But what is there that we go up against to-day in which there is not some fraud? I say that if these boys came in under the regulations laid down by the Department, they are entitled to their insurance, and we have no right to amend the Bill and cut them off.

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: I support the amendment for several reasons. I believe there has been fraud in a most repellant form. That is to say, a man lying at the point of death has been insured by interested persons who subsequently endeavoured or succeeded in drawing the insurance. After all, the pension was to benefit a dependent, and as a matter of fact, the present situation arises—I will not say from a neglect of duty or from indifference, but from a certain sort of carelessness on the part of the Department of Finance. Here the Act stood; applications were coming in; the Board expressed some doubt as to the propriety of certain applications, and the matter was referred to the Department of Finance. The Department hesitated. They delayed taking