

the purpose of giving them to the widows who married subsequently to the disability, or who married prior to the coming into force of the Pension Act of 1919. For this reason the members of the House of Commons Committee saw at once that this particular clause was inapplicable. One of them suggested to me that we should add to the clause words to the effect that no pension already existing should be disturbed. He had not made the suggestion when he realized that it was impracticable. The situation would be that you would have to say to an elderly woman: "By reason of a change in the law, your late son's wife now gets the pension of \$60 a month, and all you may expect to get is the dependent's pension of \$15 a month." It may be that the elderly woman is in urgent need of the pension and that the young widow is capable of looking after herself. Consequently the Committee felt obliged to reject that proposed clause.

Then the members of our Committee undertook to draw a clause themselves. If I have made it clear that this is a difficult problem, that it has certainly received careful consideration in the Commons, and that members of the other House have admitted again and again the weakness in the results they have achieved, and if you will believe that our Committee approached the matter sympathetically and with a desire to do something worth while, you will realize that we undertook the preparation of this clause with some trepidation. We know that this House will continue next year and the year after, and in the future opportunities will be available to interested parties to correct anything that is wrong. Our Committee has produced this clause. Since we are discussing what happened in Committee, I may as well admit that yesterday I voted for a clause complying with the suggestion in the message from the House of Commons. That was because, while realizing that it would have the effect of disturbing all those existing pensions, I thought the result on the whole would perhaps be not too bad. That proposed clause failed to carry, and now I address myself to the present clause. I am not prepared to say whether or not it goes as far as it ought to go. I have great diffidence in saying what I think it will do, but at least it is a manifestation: it puts forward the thought that members of this House recognize that there is a problem to be grappled with, and they offer this as an attempt at a solution. I believe from what has come to me that this clause will be accepted in another place, and that for a year at least we shall be doing something to deal with a situation that calls for some legislative action. It does not wholly satisfy me, but

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH.

it is a good deal better than the rejection of all the clauses, with no attempt on the part of this House to deal with the question. For that reason I support the report.

The motion for concurrence in the report was agreed to, and it was ordered that a message be sent to the House of Commons accordingly.

ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY

REPORT OF COMMITTEE

Hon. C. E. TANNER: Honourable gentlemen, on behalf of the Committee appointed to inquire into the matter of the development and improvement of the St. Lawrence river, I have the honour of submitting the third report, and in the usual procedure I am asking the leave of the House that it be adopted this afternoon.

I may be allowed to say that there is no specific finding in the report in respect to the undertaking. The Committee have heard a good deal of evidence which they regard as valuable. They regret that further time was not at their disposal to hear other witnesses whose attendance was contemplated. They suggest and recommend that the Senate might again next Session appoint a special committee to continue the inquiry, and they recommend the printing in bluebook form of the proceedings and evidence of the Committee. That is, the substance of the report which I am submitting, and in which I move concurrence.

Hon. J. D. REID: Honourable gentlemen, before this report is concurred in I would like to say a few words on the work of the Committee, and also with reference to this great undertaking. Let me say at the outset that the work of the Committee was well done, and very valuable information was obtained from those who appeared and gave evidence before the Committee. I think that the members of the Committee as a whole took very great interest in the proceedings, and they were able at the close of our sittings last night to say that the information they had obtained was very valuable to them in helping them to come to a conclusion on this problem.

Although I understand this situation perhaps as well as any other member of the Senate, I received information that I had not had before, and that is very valuable to myself in enabling me to reach a conclusion. I agree very fully with the suggestion in the report that it would be in the interest of this project that next Session a new Committee should be formed, and proceedings carried on in the same manner but I take it for