

DOTTED LINE....

can the his wife, ader takes inds hole



"Invisible income"

Unfortunately, the law also refuses to recognize the "invisible income" of the women who works in the home. Her income is invisible because she is not paid wages. But if you calculate how much a working man would have to pay to employ a cook, a laundryman, a housekeeper and a nursemaid for his children, not to mention the cost of a mistress, her contribution to the family income is more apparent.

Lawyers say that the disposition of "personal property" in a separation or divorce usually causes few hassles—but remember that such major purchases as a car fall within that category of personal property.

More serious are disagreements over the ownership of "real" property (used in the same sense as "real estate"). This was an area in which the law seemed to be going in good directions until the recent Murdoch decision.

Trueman vs Trueman

For example, in Trueman vs Trueman, a 1971 case very similar to the Murdoch case, the Alberta Appellate division ruled that the women was entitled to equal claim in the couple's farm by virtue of the farm work she had done while married.

This is still a far cry from recognition of the contributions of a wife who works in the home, but it was a step in the right direction.

The Supreme Court, however, neatly sidestepped the Trueman decision in ruling on the Murdoch. And as there is no appeal beyond the Supreme Court, further changes can only come in one of three ways: "distinguishing" (where the court decides that the Murdoch case was unique in some way and should not set a precedent for all similar cases), reversal of the Murdoch decision (fat chance!) or legislation.



Legislation amendment

Legislation is probably the most likely route to change. To this end, the Royal Commission on the Status of Women recommended in its 1970 report that "those provinces and territories, which have not already done so, amend their law in order to recognize the concept of equal partnership in marriage so that the contribution of each spouse to the marriage partnership may be acknowledged and that, upon dissolution of the marriage, each will have a right to an equal share in the assets accumulated during marriage...."

Another encouraging sign that the Victorian laws on marriage may someday change is a study now underway by the Alberta Institute of Law Research and Reform. The Institute, which has its offices in the Law Centre, hopes to release a report and recommendations on matrimonial property in late December.

But until such reform legislation is proposed and enacted, what can women do to safeguard their rights?



Marriage contracts

One possibility is the advice of the Husband—Hunter's Handbook: get a marriage contract. Though the contract can only be enforced through breach of contract suit—making it legally useful only in a really messy break-up—it can be helpful in forcing each partner to hash out his/her expectations of the other.

Since having a lawyer draw up a marriage contract may cost up to \$75 or \$100, a subtle way to introduce the idea might be to convince your parents to give it to you as a wedding present: insurance against a lot of possible future bitterness.

The surest way to safeguard the property rights of both spouses is still to insist that land titles or bills of sale for major purchases bear both names—and then to keep them in a safe place.

If you're already married, check the important documents like the title to your house to see if your name is entered as a "joint tenant with right of survivorship." If not, you can easily and inexpensively have a lawyer make the necessary changes.

Sell the idea to reluctant husbands on this basis: first, if he should die, the house (or car, or whatever...) would not be tied up in the estate. It would automatically be yours without any succession duties. Secondly, if he should ever have to declare bankruptcy, his creditors could only make claims against half the value of jointly owned property.

DINING OUT

by Satya Das

In the midst of the mushrooming multitude of meal mongers on and around 109th Street and 82nd Avenue is the recently opened Aroma Restaurant, specializing in East Indian cuisine.

A friend and I decided to see if their fare measured up to mom's home cooking and were rather pleasantly surprised.

Upon entering we were greeted by a subtle undercurrent of incense, and were shown to a table under Indian wall hangings.

The restaurant is located on the site of the former Harvey's Corned Beef Palace, and is slowly making the transition from lunch counter to full-fledged dining lounge. This was evidenced by the half complete nature of the dining area, with a partially finished painting on one wall, and preparations being made to carpet the floor.

The menu is concise, yet provides an interesting variety of Indian staples and delicacies.

My friend opted for the chicken curry and pilau (\$2.75) while I chose the chicken curry and nan (\$2.50). Pilau is the Indian version of fried rice, with nuts, peas, carrots, and other ingredients cooked into the rice. It came with a strip of silver foil on top (to aid the digestive process, health experts tell us) and the hurried pronouncement from my friend between bulging mouthfuls indicated it was very good.

Nan is a type of thick, flat, unleavened bread, oblong in shape, topped with sesame seeds and baked in the oven. It was crusty on the outside, soft on the inside, an excellent accompaniment of the chicken.

The chicken featured two meaty thighs in a spicy broth. We had asked for it extra hot, and that's the way it came. It was the genuine article, no bastardization by the use of apples, raisins, or pineapple chunks.

I also had a bowl of raita (70 cents) with my meal, it's a cool bowl of whipped yogurt with crushed cucumbers, served with paprika on top.

The remainder of the menu offers a variety of foods which would appeal to almost anyone with a taste for spicy food. These include panir, which is Indian cottage cheese, cooked with peas or curried with garbanzo beans, and samosa, curried meats deep fried in a shell.

The restaurant still offers the inevitable submarine sandwiches and assorted relatives which provide staple fare for the quick lunch eater, but will gradually steer away from this area into a menu offering strictly East Indian cuisine.

Unforgivable, we were served on paper plates, the restaurant has apparently not been open long enough to use china. Service was otherwise prompt and personal.

With Coffee and second helpings, the tab came to \$7.00 for two. If you're interested in trying East Indian food, the Aroma is a good place to start.

On Sunday morning it was off to the New World Cafe (97th Street and Jasper Avenue) for a Chinese breakfast, offered after 11 a.m.

The menu is simple. It has Chinese buns at 20 cents, they're sweet, have peices of coconut in them, and are stuffed with barbecued pork. Quite good. The other items are steamed wonton and boiled wonton, \$1.50 a dozen. Seven of us went through eight dozen, obvious testimony to their excellence. It's a good idea for brunch.

You can also have a very good Chinese breakfast at Moon's Restaurant (97th Street and 106th Avenue). The menu there is different from the New World's, and it might be a good idea because the New World becomes crowded very quickly after 11.

Southern Comfort: it's the only way to travel.

Join the fun on the S.S. Southern Comfort. The party takes off any night and the only baggage you need is some Southern Comfort, ice, and mix. See you on the levee.

Arrivals from the South:

Cold Comfort

Pour 1½ ounces of Southern Comfort over crushed ice. Add a twist of lemon.

Comfort Screwdriver

Pour 1½ ounces of Southern Comfort over ice. Top with orange juice.

Comfort Collins

Mix 1½ ounces of Southern Comfort with the juice of a quarter of a lime. Add some ice. Fill the glass with lemon-lime drink.

Try these, too:

Comfort 'n' Cola,
Comfort and Tonic,
Comfort Daiquiri, etc., etc.

