

by the Committee at the eleventh hour in dealing with this Bill. There was only one alternative to dealing with it namely, to postpone it until next Session. It must be manifest to honourable gentlemen that if this Bill is not considered along the lines of the report of the Committee, there is very little probability of anything being done. Had there not been an anxiety shown this morning to give greater consideration to it than was given in another place, no alternative would have presented itself to this Chamber but to postpone it till next Session.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: I think I stated to the Senate this morning in sufficiently clear terms that I did not intend to press this Bill on the attention of the Senate at this late hour if the Senate thought that it should be deferred. If I had been met with the suggestion that we should pass simply an amendment extending the period of the bonus, which will lapse in the autumn, and defer consideration of the Bill till next Session, I was ready to answer in the affirmative. This was not because I had any mandate to do so. It is true, the Bill was introduced by the Minister, but, after four months' work done on it by the House of Commons and in the last hours of the Session, it is sent over to us. We are entitled to give a month's attention to the Bill if we so desire. I agreed to the suggestion that it should go to a Committee in order that we might examine it and see what clauses were imperative for the proper working of the Act. We went into Committee and we did more: we examined each and every clause, and, after hearing the expert testimony that we had, we decided to go so far and no farther this Session. I concur in the report of the Committee and will support it.

Hon. Mr. BRADBURY: If the explanation that has just been made by the honourable gentleman had been given in the first place, I believe there would have been no trouble. I agree with the honourable gentleman. I see the objection. This Bill ought to have longer consideration than we can possibly give it. At the same time, I am sure that this House does not feel like throwing out the Bill.

Hon. J. H. ROSS: Oh, no.

Hon. Mr. BRADBURY: After the information given by my honourable friend, I am willing, so far as I am concerned, to accept the amendments, with the understanding that we shall give them a trial and that if we do not like them we can next year ask for a change.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: It will be for the Government to introduce amendments next year.

Hon. Mr. LAIRD: Honourable gentlemen, I feel very much the same as my honourable friend from Selkirk (Hon. Mr. Bradbury) with regard to this matter. If some explanation had accompanied the report of the Committee. I do not think I would have raised any objection to it; but, without any explanation at all, it was a little too much to expect us to emasculate a Bill that has received the serious attention of the House of Commons.

Hon. Mr. PARDEE: Honourable gentlemen have found fault with me for not making a fuller explanation. Allow me to say that it was hardly proper for me to take it upon myself to make the statements which have been made by the two honourable leaders in this House. I simply reported the Bill as Chairman of the Committee, and my duties ended there.

Section 2 was stricken out, as recommended.

On section 3—time within which application must be made:

Section 3 was agreed to.

Section 4 was agreed to.

On section 5—compassionate pension or allowance in specially meritorious cases:

Hon. Mr. PARDEE: Section 5 is amended. The word "Board," in the 5th line, and the words "composed of," in the 6th line, are stricken out.

The Hon. the CHAIRMAN: And the words "acting jointly," in line 8.

The amendments were agreed to, and section 5 as amended was agreed to.

On section 6—children of pensioner, classes 1-5:

The Hon. the CHAIRMAN: The recommendation of the Committee is that section 6 be struck out.

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: Honourable gentlemen, I think I should direct the attention of the House to the fact that section 6 and section 10 are related clauses and should be considered together. If one goes out, the other should go out.

Hon. Mr. PARDEE: They are both struck out.

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: I am not saying at all that both should go out. I am just drawing attention to the fact that they are related. Section 6 deals with the children, and section 10 deals with the widow. These refer to a provision in the Pension Act that if a man pensioned in any of the classes from 80 to 100 per cent dies within a period of