

Mr. CANNON: If such be the case the clause as it reads now covers both cases.

Mr. CLARK: No, she is also a widow.

Mr. CANNON: The alien woman who has married a British subject becomes a British subject, and she is a British subject after her husband dies. Her case is covered by the first part of paragraph (a) "is a British subject." The second part of the paragraph deals with something else, the woman who marries an alien and ceases to be a British subject during her marriage. She regains her British citizenship when the husband dies. Therefore the paragraph as it reads now covers both cases.

Mr. CLARK: I think the hon. gentleman is wrong. Widows are specifically named. British subjects are covered, but in the case of widows they must have had the status of British citizenship before marriage.

Mr. CANNON: If she had British citizenship before her marriage she is covered by the words, "is a British subject." If she is a widow and is a British subject, "is a British subject" covers her case. The other case is covered by the latter part of the clause

Mr. STEVENS: My only point was that it should be made quite clear. Every province will probably put that interpretation upon it, but we should put it beyond all peradventure of a doubt.

Mr. GEARY: Paragraph (f) of section 8 says:

Is not in receipt of an income of as much as three hundred and sixty-five dollars (\$365) a year.

We have had some very sympathetic expressions about the soldiers to-night. A soldier may have an income of \$365 by way of a pension. He has earned that; it is coming to him for a definite permanent impairment of his value in the labour market. That persists after the age of seventy, but he is put in the position of practically losing part of it in comparison with other people when he is forced to give up any claim to a pension in this act because of having that \$365 of a pension. It seems to me that as far as soldiers go their pension of \$365, or whatever it may be, should be preserved to them, and not be used as a reason for depriving them of the \$240 pension under this act.

Mr. HEAPS: I rise to protest in a very mild way against the remarks of the Minister of Labour. He has talked about receiving our coöperation. Coöperation implies two parties. You cannot have coöperation unless

you have someone to coöperate with, and so far as the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre and myself are concerned, we are only too glad to coöperate with the government in putting through any legislation that we deem to be in the best interests of the Dominion. But if the Minister of Labour implies by coöperation that we have to accept everything that comes to this House, let me tell him that that is not coöperation. Secondly, the position that I am taking here to-night is exactly the position I took here last year. I have spoken on only two clauses of the bill—one dealing with the amount contributed by the federal treasury; the other I have dealt with and called to the attention of the House. These are the very same matters I brought to the attention of the government last year when the bill was introduced. My position has not changed one iota from that which I took last year, but the position of the Minister of Labour has changed.

Mr. GEARY: Would the minister tell me what he thinks of the suggestion in regard to clause (f)? It would mean the insertion after the word "income" of some such words as this:

Not being a pensioner for war service.

Then the clause would read:

Is not in receipt of an income, not being a pensioner for war service, of as much as \$365 a year.

Mr. HEENAN: We have great sympathy with the returned soldiers, but there are requisitions coming from all sides, and we cannot make any exception in this bill to-night. I think every consideration for the returned soldier will be afforded in another bill.

Mr. CLARK: What is the bill?

Mr. HEENAN: A bill relating to the soldiers' pensions.

Mr. STEVENS: Will the minister accept a suggestion for which I am indebted to my hon. friend from Comox-Alberni, to make in paragraph (a) read:

Is a British subject, or, being a widow, is such at the time of the application, or was such before her marriage.

Mr. CANNON: "Such" would apply to "widow". Well, she is a widow.

Mr. STEVENS: No, to "British subjects". My hon. friend should not joke.

Mr. CANNON: I am not joking. If you want to pick a fight, I will not accept.

Mr. STEVENS: I am not addressing the Solicitor General, but some of his hilarious colleagues. The section would read: