### THE SENATE

Thursday, June 7, 1928.

The Senate met at 3 p.m., the Speaker in the Chair.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

# PRIVATE BILLS THIRD READINGS

Bill 57, an Act respecting the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway Company.—Hon. Mr. Griesbach.

Bill 71, an Act to incorporate the St. Lawrence River Bridge Company.—Hon. Mr. Hardy.

## MARRIAGE PROTECTION (VENEREAL DISEASE) BILL

#### REPORT OF COMMITTEE

Hon. Mr. BELAND moved concurrence in the third report of the Standing Committee on Public Health and Inspection of Foods, to whom was referred Bill D, an Act to make Venereal Disease an Impediment to Marriage.

The motion was agreed to.

The Hon, the SPEAKER: Does the honourable gentleman in charge of the Bill wish to withdraw it?

Hon. Mr. GIRROIR: The Committee recommend that the Bill be held over.

Hon. Mr. BELAND: The recommendation of the Committee is that the Bill be not proceeded with until fuller information is secured.

The Hon, the SPEAKER: That means that the Bill will stand for this Session.

### PENSION BILL

REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON MESSAGE FROM HOUSE OF COMMONS

Hon. J. A. CALDER moved concurrence in the report of the Special Committee to whom was referred a message from the House of Commons agreeing to certain amendments made in the Senate to bill 289, an Act to amend the Pension Act, and disagreeing with other amendments.

He said: Honourable gentlemen, before the House is called upon to vote on concurrence in this report I think it advisable that I should make a further statement in explanation. I am sure we all realize that the report presented to us is in many respects of a very technical character, and unless one has followed the legislation and knows exactly what

Hon. Mr. HARDY.

these various clauses purport to do, it must be difficult to understand what we aim to accomplish. I have therefore prepared an additional very brief statement, which I would like to submit to the House, and with your permission I will read it. It is quite likely that we shall have a discussion on this matter, and what I have to say may afterwards be supplemented by other members of the Committee.

As Chairman of the Special Committee appointed to consider the message received from the House of Commons with regard to our amendments to Bill 289, I desire to add some explanation to the report just submitted to you for consideration.

In their message the House of Commons declared that they disagreed with our amendments to six clauses, namely, 2 (a), 7, 12, 25, 30 (10) and 31. I shall deal with these briefly, and attempt to indicate the decisions reached by your Committee in each case. Doubtless, if we have a debate, other members of the Committee will elaborate, if necessary, the reasons for the conclusions reached.

With respect to clause 2 (a), upon which there was a disagreement between the two Houses, this clause as it stands in the original Bill is intended to re-define and extend the definition of the expression "appearance of the injury or disease," a term that is used throughout the law, to a greater or less extent. All through our discussions it was admitted that that clause had a direct relation to clause 25 of the Bill, and that its retention or rejection depended upon the final decision of the Committee with respect to clause 25, which is the clause that debars a widow from receiving a pension if she marries a soldier after the appearance of his injury or disease.

As your Committee finally approved a new clause 25, it was generally admitted that clause 2 (a) was unnecessary. We therefore recommend that the Senate insists on its amendment, which will have the effect of striking clause 2 (a) from the Bill. I think there will be no dissention as far as that is concerned.

For the reasons set forth in our report we recommend that the Senate also insists on its amendment to clause 7.

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE E. FOSTER: What is the purport of the clause?

Hon. Mr. CALDER: That will come in the explanation. The clause of the report is as follows:

2. That the Senate doth insist on its sixth amendment, striking out clause 7, because un-