

the cost involved in the passing of the Bill as it stands, without the amendment proposed by this Committee.

Hon. Mr. LYNCH-STANTON: The additional cost?

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: I am talking about what it would cost if we passed this clause.

Hon. Mr. LYNCH-STANTON: Additional to what we are paying at present?

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: Yes; whenever I speak of cost I mean additional cost.

Hon. Mr. FOWLER: You mean the cost additional by restoring the condition of 1919?

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: 1919 on top of of the present expenses. I said that the law of 1919 stood to September 1920, and at that time the law was altered, and if we pass the Bill and reject the amendment we have to deal with the arrears. We have to deal with those people who, had the law not been changed in 1920, would continue to have been dealt with under the Pension Act; so I shall refer to those people as the arrears to be dealt with.

We asked the Board of Pension Commissioners what it would cost to deal with those arrears, and I take it that the Board of Pension Commissioners could give us precise information on that point. The information that they gave us is that it would cost \$450,000 in a lump sum to compensate or to deal with those arrears.

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE E. FOSTER: Up to date?

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: Up to the 31st of March of the present year. That, I take it, is definite and known amount to settle with them,—\$450,000. Then the question arises, what would the obligation be with respect to the future? Upon that score it was apparent to the members of the Committee that only an estimate could be given. It is obvious to the Committee that men die, and that the pension of a man thereupon ceases. If you consult the tables in the Act, you will see a pensioner gets a pension himself during his lifetime according to his disability, and according to his disability his wife gets something, and his children get something. On his death the pension to him ceases, and the widow goes off what is called the Married Women's Allowance, and comes on the pension; and I fancy, although I have no information on that score, that the pension to the widow and the pension to the children after the husband's death will exceed what the pension to the husband and the allowance to

the woman and the children were before the death. That is why we have an increase due to this clause.

Hon. Mr. FOWLER: At what age does the pension to the children stop?

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: Seventeen and sixteen; under very special circumstances there may be provision for a year or so longer to provide for higher education.

Now, the Board of Pension Commissioners estimate that for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1924, the amount required in respect of this class will be \$100,000; and then they make this assertion, which I am not able to controvert, and which honourable members will find a little difficult to understand—they make this extraordinary assertion, and it may be perfectly sound, based upon tables of mortality, that \$100,000 would be required to cover the period from March 31, 1923, to March 31, 1924, and that every year thereafter the amount will be increased by \$100,000. That is to say, the first year, \$100,000; the second year, \$200,000; the third year, \$300,000; and so on; the tenth year, \$1,000,000; the twentieth year, \$2,000,000; the twenty-fifth year, due to mortality, a larger amount. In the twenty-fifth year, when the decrease will begin, the total amount which will have been paid, according to this estimate, with respect to this class, will be \$32,000,000 in 25 years. In the twenty-fifth year I suppose the amount paid would be \$2,500,000.

I may say that this estimate is questioned. I have examined the questioning, and I am bound to say that the questioning is no stronger than the estimate. The questioning may be right or wrong, and this estimate may be right or wrong. After all, these men are the advisers of the Government in matters of this sort, and we must deal with their information as correct.

Hon. Mr. TODD: Quite a small percentage in number would come under this clause.

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: Quite a small percentage.

Hon. Mr. TODD: What I am trying to get at is this. If this class of pension, which I imagine would be small in proportion, amounts to \$32,000,000 in 25 years, what would the total be?

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: Our pensions now are \$31,000,000 odd a year, and if they were not increased or decreased they would amount in the aggregate to \$310,000,000 in 10 years. I was going to say that, after the consideration of \$32,000,000, one is apt to be staggered.