

Committee in accordance with a sort of *entente cordiale* that has developed between the two Houses in the discussion of this matter. I think it only fair to say that.

I would like to offer a few observations with regard to this section 25, the clause dealing with pension to the widow who married subsequently to the appearance of the disability. When, a few days ago, I spoke on this question I said that the law was very technical, very complex, very difficult to understand, very difficult to explain, and it is necessary only to repeat to the Senate at this time the story of this particular clause in order to bring out how difficult the question has been. When our Committee first assembled we had laid before us the Bill as it came from the House of Commons, and clause 25 proposed to deal with this case. Before the Bill came to us at all I had called upon certain members of the Committee of the other House and asked them what this clause meant, how it would operate, what it would cost, and so forth, and I found the members of that Committee very shaky on the clause—very shaky indeed. So when we reached this clause in our Committee we adopted the somewhat unusual expedient of asking certain prominent members of the Committee of the other House to attend upon us and discuss the clause with us. It must be borne in mind that the Committee of the Commons held 47 sessions and the evidence that it took comprises 250 printed pages. As a result of the 47 meetings and the 250 printed pages the Commons Committee produce section 25 of the Bill. Certain members of that Committee came before us the other day, and the discussion had lasted only five or ten minutes when they entirely receded from the position taken on this clause of the Bill, admitting that it was practically useless, it could not be explained, and they had grave doubts that it would work. They themselves offered us another clause, which I read the other day, and will read again:

No pension shall be paid to the widow of a member of the forces who was married to him after the appearance of the injury or disease which resulted in his death unless in the opinion of the Commission the condition of such member of the forces was at the time of the marriage such that it would be reasonable to anticipate that the injury or disease would not result in death.

Previously we had ascertained that, so far as the records of the Pension Commission show, there are about 700 widows whose husbands died of their pensionable disability and who married prior to the appearance of the disability. Having received this clause from these gentlemen in lieu of what is contained in the Bill, we proceeded to test it by asking

one question. We asked, "What effect will this clause have with respect to these 700 widows for whom we are particularly anxious to do something?" These gentlemen at once turned to the members of the Board of Pension Commissioners, who were present, and asked them, as we all did, how they would interpret the clause with respect to those widows. Their immediate answer—and we all agreed, I think, with the soundness of it—was this: "In the case of these 700 widows, as we interpret this clause, we believe they would get nothing under it, because when they were married it must have been reasonable, in the opinion of the Commission, to anticipate that the injury or disease would not result in death, and in point of fact the husbands are all dead." How could the Commission interpret this clause favourably to those 700 widows when the men have actually died?

Hon. Mr. CALDER: From their disability.

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: From their disability. Consequently it was seen at once that the clause served no useful purpose.

Then there was submitted to us a clause from the representatives of ex-service men. Here again we found that so much was left to the discretion of the Commission, by the use of the words "an early death", that if this clause were applied to the case of the 700 widows they would get nothing.

Then we had further discussion, and we drafted our report. It was passed on to the Commons, and again we had members of the other House come before us. They submitted a clause, and later a prominent member of their Committee came before us and submitted another clause, making some slight changes. We tested this clause by another question. I may inform honourable gentlemen that in these cases in which the widow married subsequently to the appearance of the disability and the pensioner is dead, the widow gets no pension, but a pension is payable to a dependent father or mother who may be somewhere in the offing. Therefore, in the case of these 700 widows there are likely to be, and no doubt there are, a number of dependents now securing the pension which the widow would otherwise have. Consequently, the adoption of a clause drawn in accordance with the suggestion contained in the message from the House of Commons and the application of that clause to the situation which I have just outlined would result in this situation, that the Government must inform dependents who for nine years, up to last year, or for part of that period, have been in the enjoyment of dependents' pensions, that it is taking these pensions away from them for