

*Succession Duty Act*

Mr. ILSLEY: Just a moment; I have asked a question for information. Are hon. members arguing that a man who loses his life while training in time of peace, who has not volunteered for service for any war abroad, should be treated differently as regards succession duties from the man who does not train in a summer camp?

Mr. GREEN: If a man gives his life while he is out training to defend his country he has the right I have described. I would urge upon the minister that we cannot get away from the Pension Act. He must base his section in the succession duties legislation on the provisions of the Pension Act. Otherwise it will be like a ship without a rudder. There would be no way of determining what active service is.

Mr. MACDONALD (Brantford City): The minister has asked for the opinions of hon. members. I do not believe that a man who in peace time goes to military camp for two weeks training should get the benefit of this section. He has not offered his life in any way for his country. True, he joined a militia unit—and no one has more respect for the militia units than I have—but he has not offered himself for service outside Canada. He has only offered to take two weeks training at a military camp. I do not believe such a man should receive the benefits of this section. I agree that a man who, in time of war, volunteers for service, joins a unit that is likely to go overseas, and is killed in Canada, should get the benefit of this measure. The minister has asked for our opinions, and I am definitely not in favour of giving pension to men who are called for two weeks training only in Canada.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): Does the hon. member believe that the pension law is wrong, and that a man should not receive a pension under the conditions the hon. member has mentioned?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): He can.

Mr. MACDONALD (Brantford City): Under the Pension Act as it is drawn, and as it passed this house yesterday, there is provision for a man who is killed during two weeks service. There is provision that his wife shall receive a pension.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): I do not understand the hon. member's argument at all. In one case the man is getting a tremendous benefit, and in the other, his widow is getting a very small benefit. In the case of the Succession Duty Act the benefit is very small, when compared with the pension which would be received.

[Mr. Green.]

I suggest that the hon. member should be consistent and argue that the Pension Act as now drafted is wrong, and that the man is not entitled to pension. I suggest that the consideration for the exemption must be the pension. It should not be anything else; the pension is really the consideration.

Mr. MACDONALD (Brantford City): As the bill is now drawn, the obtaining of the benefits of the section are dependent upon active service, and a pension. That is the intention of the legislation. I do not think we should widen it, and give benefit to those who do nothing but take two weeks training.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): I suggest that the hon. member ought to be consistent. He is arguing against the man getting a pension under the conditions he has set out. I do not see how it can be otherwise. I really believe that the consideration must be the pension.

Mr. GREEN: There would be perhaps only one case a year, or one in two or three years in the militia, where a man would be killed while in training. It would not be a matter of involving the country in a great loss of revenue. The principle should be that if a man's widow can establish entitlement to a pension, she should have the right to exemption under the Succession Duty Act.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Apparently the hon. member for Vancouver South is in favour of giving a member who stubs his toe in the Jackson building here a government pension.

Mr. GREEN: The hon. member for Fraser Valley could not have had both his ears open. As he knows very well, a member in the Jackson building could not qualify for a pension. His widow would have to show that the death arose out of his service or was directly attributable to his service. If he stubbed his toe, his widow could not qualify.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: If he stubbed his toe, he could qualify if we took the interpretation of the hon. member for Vancouver South.

Mr. MacNICOL: When I raised the question I was thinking of two fliers from my riding who were killed recently. Perhaps hon. members will remember the accident near Winnipeg in which two fliers were killed, and the other one near lake Erie where another two were killed. In each case one of the men resided in my riding. I do not know whether they were married; but if we assume that they were, their widows should qualify under this provision. I believe one man was an instructor and the other was finishing his training.