

opinion of the Commission, entitled to be maintained by him at the time of his death and for a reasonable time previously thereto.

2. No pension shall be paid to the widow of a member of the forces unless she was married to him before the appearance of the injury or disease which resulted in his death—

(a) Unless the injury in respect of which he was pensioned or entitled to pension would not shorten his expectancy of life; or

(b) Unless he was not chronically ill of a pensionable disease and not in receipt of pension in respect thereof.

Then, it is proposed that this new provision shall not be made retroactive. We found that if that were done in many cases, widows would be entitled to sums running from \$3,000 up to \$7,000 in a lump sum. Consequently the Committee decided that as it is a new principle to be adopted, it should not be made retroactive, but should begin to run from the date that this law would come into effect.

With respect to clause 30 (10), which is purely administrative, your Committee has recommended that the suggestion contained in the message of the House of Commons should be adopted. This clause deals with the officers, clerks and employees of the Board of Appeal.

Right Hon. Mr. GRAHAM: Would the honourable gentleman kindly review that clause about the clerks and employees?

Hon. Mr. CALDER: It is this way. The Appeal Board shall be attached to the Department of Pensions and Health, and the expenses required to be incurred for the discharge of its duties, including the salaries of its officers, clerks, and other employees, shall, on the approval of the Board, be paid out of the moneys provided by Parliament. We felt that as the Board has a small staff, and knows what is required of it, where it should go, and what expenses it should incur; in order to avoid conflict between the head of the Board of Appeal and the deputy head of the Department, as to what expenses should be allowed the men, once the stamp of the Board is put on it is just a matter of costs.

As to clause 31, the sixth paragraph of our report is as follows:

6. That the Senate doth insist on its twelfth amendment, amending clause 31, because under the existing law the soldier himself, or in the event of his death his widow, his children or his parents, have the right of appeal on the ground that the injury or disease or aggravation thereof resulting in disability or death was attributable to or was incurred during military service.

That is, in appeals from the Board of Pension Commissioners to the Appeal Board, the existing law is quite clear, that a soldier

Hon. Mr. CALDER.

himself, or, if he dies, his widow, his children, or his parents, have a right to appeal to the Appeal Board, in case of pension being refused by the Board of Pension Commissioners. There is no doubt about that: the law is quite clear in that respect.

In regard to paragraphs (a) and (b) of clause 31, which we recommend to be struck out, they are not clear. If you read them, you will find the greatest difficulty in understanding just exactly what they mean. It has been represented to us, so far as the very best information we could get is concerned, that those paragraphs (a) and (b) of clause 31 are intended to give a right of appeal to dependents other than a widow or children, who claim their financial resources are inadequate. So our report states:

Paragraphs (a) and (b) of this clause, while not clear, are intended to change the existing principle of the right of appeal, particularly for dependents, other than widows and children, who claim their financial resources are inadequate. The Senate is of the view this is not advisable.

I thought it advisable to make that additional statement in order that members of the House might at least try to grasp some of the features of this very technical trouble. It is quite likely that if we have a discussion of the report, other members of the Committee will supplement what I have had to say.

Hon. J. D. TAYLOR: Honourable gentlemen, I do not think a matter like this should be passed without any remarks at all. Being naturally modest, I am somewhat diffident about standing up, seeing that I was the subject of a mild lecture yesterday for being a partisan on this subject. The application of that remark puzzled me a little, if it meant that I acted as a political partisan, for my desire expressed at the moment was to support the Government, which had not been a fixed habit of mine. If, on the other hand, the suggestion was that I was a partisan of the soldiers who are petitioning Parliament, I am rather proud to plead guilty to the indictment.

It is true that during the war I was not able to give much active service myself, but I was very active in enlisting soldiers. I probably enlisted 2,000—1,000 besides the regiment which I was permitted to take as far as England—and I remember very well, during that campaign, the wealth of assurance that was poured out to all the relatives, the fathers and mothers and dependents of those soldiers, as to what we would do for them when they came back. The recollection is still vivid in