

That a pension shall be paid when the marriage took place prior to a date one year after discharge of the member of the forces.

I support that because it covers the case of a man who at the time he went on service was engaged to be married, but postponed the marriage till his return. Had he decided to marry while on service he would have placed his wife on separation allowance, patriotic fund payments, etc., and would have laid upon the country the obligation to pension his wife in the event of his death. But it suited the arrangements of himself and his prospective wife that he should go to the war under an engagement and should not marry her till his return. We interest ourselves in the process of the civil re-establishment of the soldier. We have a Department for that purpose. Surely it will not be denied that the marriage of a man after discharge from the service is a part of his civil re-establishment; and if in the course of civilly re-establishing himself he intends to marry the woman to whom he was previously engaged, surely he should have at least a year in which to make his arrangements. I submit that if that man marries in accordance with the pre-war engagement, his wife ought to rank with those wives who sent their husbands to the war. The purpose of this clause is to allow one year for the soldier to have arranged his marriage. If you strike out this clause, the situation is that a woman gets no pension at all if she has married a man with a disability.

Hon. Mr. PARDEE: Honourable gentlemen, all I have to say in regard to that is that it was discussed in Committee. The old argument came up, as to whether or not a woman, knowing a man had a disability and marrying him, could profit by any pension. There may be something in what the honourable gentleman says, but we discussed that question and were not quite able to arrive at any definite means of putting his idea into effect. Speaking for myself, I sympathize with a man who was engaged, went to war, came back disabled, and carried out his marriage engagement. Nevertheless we must realize the fact that by allowing the clause to remain as it is in the Bill you are opening the door to men who had disabilities, whether trivial or serious, and who got married; you are simply taking upon yourself something that will result in a vast liability. For this reason the Committee thought it better to strike out the clause.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: There is a difficulty in dealing with such hypothetical cases as that mentioned by the honourable gentleman from Edmonton (Hon. Mr. Gries-

bach.) We had the advantage of his presence at the meeting of the Committee, and we invited him to give a free expression of his views upon the subject, which he did to the extent that appealed to his judgment. From what I know of this class of legislation and from my own experience in administering a department, I regard this as a dangerous type of legislation. The one-year provision is arbitrary, and there will soon be many cases which will require this period to be one year and six months, then two years, then three years, then four and so on. That is to say, if you fix a period of time, there will be some who are just outside the boundary, and application will be made to Parliament or to the Department for an extension of the time. The State in my judgment is not under an obligation to the wife who married after the discharge of the soldier.

Section 9 was stricken out, as recommended.

On section 10—when pensioned prior to disability:

The Hon. the CHAIRMAN: Section 10 is stricken out.

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: I do not agree to that; but if you have stricken out section 6, you have to strike out section 10, because they are related clauses.

The Hon. the CHAIRMAN: Section 6 has been stricken out.

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: Then necessarily section 10 goes with it.

Section 10 was stricken out, as recommended.

The Hon. the CHAIRMAN: Section 11 is struck out.

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: By virtue of what?

The Hon. the CHAIRMAN: The Committee's report.

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: Well, we will discuss that a bit. I had agreed that this was a dangerous clause, but I would ask the Chairman of the Committee to explain the clause so that the members of the House may know what they are voting on. This is the clause which involves the expenditure of \$616,000, altering the status?

Hon. Mr. PARDEE: Yes, altering the status of prospective dependent cases. The old Act read:

When a parent or person in the place of a parent who was not wholly or to a substantial extent maintained by the member of the forces at the time of