

*Pension Act—Mr. Quelch*

have the right to express his feelings in full. The point I make is that the committee was dominated by the Minister of Pensions and National Health in so far as the deadline was concerned. I say that because after the minister made the statement that he could not accept the suggestion, hon. members felt—and I am not criticizing them unduly—that as they were not going to be able to get certain things they wanted, they would get the best they could. Nevertheless, in spite of that I feel that the members of the pensions committee should have held to whatever views they had, and that they should have drafted a report asking for this or for that, even if they knew the minister was not agreeable to granting their requests. Then they should have let the house decide whether or not their requests were in order.

All hon. members opposite know that what I say is true, but for certain reasons they may feel it is not wise to make the admission. That, however, is one of the weaknesses of the system under which we are operating. It is a two-party or three-party system, whatever you wish to call it; but hon. members are not free to stand up to their convictions. I am sure hon. members opposite would not say for one minute that they are in accord with everything the government formed from their party has done. But under our political system, they do not raise their voices in protest; on the contrary they consider it expedient to remain silent while certain things are done with which they do not agree. It would be futile for any hon. member opposite to object to that statement.

The injustices under this bill are the deadline respecting children, the deadline respecting applications for pensions which expire in 1942, and the deadline with regard to marriages. These are injustices. I cannot see why a young soldier should be penalized, or why we should say to him, "Unless you marry before a certain date your wife will have no chance to receive a pension later." We are penalizing the younger soldiers.

Many hon. members emphasized the point that at least we are removing the deadline in so far as soldiers of this war are concerned. But, Mr. Speaker, we know very well that long before the twelve-year deadline period expires a committee will be arranged to make changes. And what will be their excuse for doing so? The excuse will be that we recognized the justice of a deadline so far as soldiers in the last war were concerned, and if it was just to have a deadline for them, it is just to have one for soldiers in this war. That is why I opposed it. The hon.

(Mr. Quelch.)

member for Fraser Valley (Mr. Cruickshank) also opposed it in committee, and refused to make the report unanimous.

One hon. member has objected to the statement that even to-day there are soldiers who are not receiving any consideration. I could tell him of a number of cases. I could tell him about a returned soldier who is bedridden and cannot obtain a dollar of assistance by way of pension. He is on relief. Why? Because he falls on the margin. He did not serve in a theatre of actual warfare, and therefore he cannot get the war veterans' allowance. Yet I believe he should receive some consideration. There is no way in which that man can obtain any help, either under the Pension Act or under the War Veterans' Allowance Act. Perhaps when we are discussing that act I may enlarge upon this point. We know there are still some loopholes in the War Veterans' Allowance Act, and we must take care of those loopholes so that the soldiers who are veterans but who did not serve in an actual theatre of war may receive some consideration. I do hope that when the committee meets to discuss the War Veterans' Allowance Act we shall be able to make pensions available at least to the widows of veterans who during their lifetime were receiving some form of financial consideration from the government.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

## DOMINION SUCCESSION DUTY ACT

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance) moved the second reading of Bill No. 79, to authorize the levying of duties in respect of successions.

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a few observations respecting the principle of this bill, and I do so without any intention whatsoever of obstructing its passage.

The minister has made it plain that the government has adopted this form of taxation without any regard whatsoever to the fact that this field of taxation is one which heretofore has been reserved to the provinces. I do not desire to debate the question whether or not we should have succession duties, because at this late date in my opinion it would be futile to do so. We have them; we shall always have them. In passing, however, I should like to express my regret that in its desire to increase the revenues the government should have invaded this field without having endeavoured to come to any accommodation whatsoever with the provinces, either in respect of the quantum of the tax or in