

through second reading in the hope that perhaps we may offer some constructive suggestions when the bill comes into committee. That is about all that I have to say at this time, Mr. Speaker

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Golding in the chair.

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

On section 3—Payment of gratuity in case of death of member of the forces.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Might I ask under which section "misconduct" will come?

Mr. TUCKER: Sections 10, 11 and 12 deal with "misconduct". We have not reached them yet.

Mr. WRIGHT: Section 2 (1) gives the definition of "misconduct".

Mr. MARSHALL: I should like to say a word on this section. It says, and I quote:

(1) If a member of the forces dies on service or after discharge but before he has been paid gratuity in full, payment of the gratuity or the unpaid balance thereof shall be made:

(a) to a person who was in receipt of or who, in the opinion of the dependents' allowance board, was eligible for dependents' allowance on behalf of the deceased member immediately prior to the member's death or discharge.

We dealt with this section in committee. At page 255 of the proceedings of that committee the hon. member for Acadia had this to say, and I should like to put it on *Hansard* because it sums up the whole matter from our point of view:

A man's life is the main thing. If a man goes through the war he gets a gratuity, and if a man is wounded he gets a gratuity up to the time of his discharge. I understand now that the department are considering giving a gratuity while undergoing hospitalization. If a man is killed overseas the gratuity should be paid up until the end of the war.

That is the point around which the discussion centred and we are still of that opinion. This gratuity should not be cut off as of the date of death but should be extended to the end of the war.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I do not want to start an argument at five minutes to six o'clock, but I should like to ask another question for the sake of clarification. A recommendation was brought in by a special sub-committee as to the meaning of "misconduct", and I wish to know when this recommendation will be brought before the house. As a member of that committee I am prepared to accept the various clauses, but I understand that the matter dealt with by the sub-committee is to be put in a separate recommendation to the

house, concerning a different department of the government. However, I think we might have that recommendation explained.

Mr. TUCKER: The subcommittee to which the hon. member refers dealt with the difficulty a man might experience in finding employment after his discharge if it was stated on his discharge certificate that he had been discharged for misconduct. It was considered that this would be a great handicap. The subcommittee which studied the matter made a recommendation, but it is not a matter for our department since, of course, discharges come under the Department of National Defence. However, at the next meeting of our committee we plan to study the recommendation of the subcommittee and to hear representations in the matter from the Department of National Defence, in the hope of making some tangible and helpful recommendation to parliament with regard to this matter.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: As one member of that committee I cannot quite see eye-to-eye with the chairman of the committee. I do not see how one can recommend the adoption of a bill which, as I understand it, defines what "misconduct" means, without bringing before parliament the interpretation of "misconduct" as far as the act is concerned. I brought up this matter in the committee, and I intend to stay with it, but I wish to know what the recommendation of the committee was. Whatever it was, I am quite prepared to abide by the majority, but I want to know what the recommendation of the committee was with regard to the recommendation brought in by the subcommittee in reference to misconduct.

Mr. TUCKER: In the first place I think the hon. member is under a misapprehension as to the purpose of the subcommittee. The committee accepted the definition of "misconduct"—

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Oh, no.

Mr. TUCKER: That is correct; the committee accepted the definition of "misconduct". The purpose of the sub-committee was to see if something could not be done, when the appeal board ruled that a service man should get his gratuity and reestablishment credit, to have a new discharge certificate issued or something of that sort, so that when he went to hunt for employment he would not have to show a certificate which indicated that he was discharged for misconduct. But "misconduct" as defined in the act was actually accepted by the committee on the understanding that this sub-committee would study this other related question. It did so and