

five miles, and on coming back he stumbled into a hole and broke his leg; he would partake, would he not?

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: I think he would, if he was walking along the road. But suppose, for the sake of argument, that he was passing an orchard in which there was a good deal of fruit hanging from the trees, and he climbed the fence and climbed a tree to get a couple of apples, and he fell off the tree and broke his leg, he would get a pension, but his dependants would not, because, though he had been injured while in military service, his injury was not due to military service.

Hon. Mr. FOWLER: If he was entitled to a pension, his dependants should be entitled to a pension.

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: Quite so. The Act of 1919 gave to the man injured on service a pension, and provided that in the event of his death his dependants should receive a pension. The Act of 1920 continues that provision with respect to the man injured due to service, but it provides that the dependants of the pensioner injured while on the service in the way I have described are not entitled to pension. Therefore, looking back on the war as an episode, you have in this country, living side by side, two women. The husband of one woman had his leg broken in a runaway accident by the artillery running over him; he got a pension; he is dead, and she gets a pension. The other woman's husband, we will say, climbed an apple tree to pick an apple, or was injured in a bus accident in London; in his lifetime he got a pension, but on his death his wife does not get a pension.

Now, it is a question of contract, and I think I have established the contract. It is a question of right and justice as one looks at it in retrospect, so to speak; and I think I have established my case, to my own satisfaction at all events, and I believe to the satisfaction of the ex-service men in this House. It is to be borne in mind that from 1919 to 1920 the pensions were running on the insurance principle. In 1920 that is cut off, so that you have people in Canada today, women and children, drawing pensions for husbands and fathers who were pensioned on the insurance principle between certain dates, and not pensioned after the year—a form of injustice and unfairness that will be apparent to every one of you.

Hon. Mr. LYNCH-STANTON: How will these amendments affect the ex-service men—that is, the Act of 1920 and the amendments proposed now?

Hon. Mr. LYNCH-STANTON.

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: The Bill proposes to restore the conditions of 1919 as altered by 1920—the repeal of the 1920 Act, and restoring the conditions of 1919.

Hon. Mr. FOWLER: What about the Committee?

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: The Committee proposes to strike out the paragraph in the Bill, and leave the law as it was in 1920.

Hon. Mr. LYNCH-STANTON: They do not intend to legislate.

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: They do not intend to legislate in respect to that portion of the Bill. I should add that at the present moment, under the interpretation of the law, all men who suffered an injury while on service, resulting in disability, are pensionable, but only those dependants who belong to a man who suffered an injury due to military service receive a pension.

Hon. Mr. LYNCH-STANTON: How wide is military service? What is an injury received in military service?

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: Due to military service? Give me any case you like.

Hon. Mr. LYNCH-STANTON: I do not mean physical injury. What is the extent?

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: Here is a man who desires to go from one place to another, and he is run over by a motor car. He can suffer injury that is not due to his military service. That is my argument. Now, having turned to the question of justice and right, I must in fairness turn to the question of cost, because trouble has been that everybody is willing to discuss the rights of soldiers, but very few people are willing to discuss with any degree of courage and common sense the question of cost, and we will never get anywhere in endeavouring to put our ex-service men in a proper position unless at the same time that we discuss the rights and obligations we also discuss cost.

Hon. Mr. FOWLER: I go with you all the way except that. I think the question of justice and right is more important than the question of cost.

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: Quite so. The question of justice and right is of paramount importance, but what good is it to arrive at a conclusion as to justice and right when we have exceeded the financial ability of the country? And, after all, a bankrupt Canada is no good to anybody, and least of all to the ex-service men. Now, I want to discuss the cost that has been given. We have been given