

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: The case which my honourable friend mentioned is the case of a man who is said to have had at the time of his enlistment a defect—

Hon. Mr. TAYLOR: No.

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: Very well. He goes over to the front, serves there and is injured. Upon his making application to the Board of Pension Commissioners they allege that a portion of his disability is pre-enlistment, and they pension him, according to the statement of the honourable gentleman, for only that part of his disability which is aggravated by service. That is, I think, the statement that the honourable gentleman made. Now, if that is true, and if my honourable friend is in possession of all the facts of the case, and the Board of Pension Commissioners are in possession of all the facts, then the Board of Pension Commissioners have acted in defiance of the law.

Hon. Mr. TAYLOR: No—if the honourable gentleman will permit me. If he will read that, he will see that the Board can play upon words there to justify their action, because what they have done is contrary not to the bare words of that section, but to the spirit of it.

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: Then I will put it another way. Here is the law. The honourable gentleman has the facts. Let him fit the facts to the law, or the law to the facts, and put the statement of the case before the Board of Pension Commissioners. I have had lengthy experience with these cases and with the Pension Board and the Board of Appeal, and I have had occasion to investigate just such statements as these, and in some cases I have found that the failure to get anywhere before the Board of Pension Commissioners has been a failure to assemble the facts; and I think I may say this, in justice to both these Boards, that when we have come to close grips I have found that the Boards have acted in accordance with the law as they interpreted the law. At all events, here is the law, and the Committee have reported that in their judgment the law as it stands is just and fair. That is all there is to be said about that.

Let us pass now to the next case raised by my honourable friend. He speaks of a woman who married a soldier subsequently to the appearance of his disability, and whose husband lived ten years. This morning he told us that there were three children of that marriage. I immediately asked a question and

Hon. Mr. TAYLOR.

got from the Chairman of the Board of Pension Commissioners this information, that in point of actual fact the woman does not get a pension, but the pension awarded to the three children by reason of the fact that the pensioner died of his pensionable disability is only \$12 a month less than the total amount would be if a pension were paid to the widow and the children received the dependents' allowance. So in that case there is no great hardship. Where the hardship comes in is in the fact that when the boy is sixteen and the girl is seventeen they will go off pension and then there will be no income at all from that source, whereas if the wife were pensioned she would continue to receive her pension after the children had reached the ages that I have mentioned.

Now, in justice to Colonel Ralston, who appeared before us, I desire to state precisely my recollection of what he said when he had read to him and when he read over the amendment to section 25 which forms part of the report.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: A statement which he did not volunteer, but which the Committee asked of him.

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: I myself asked.

Hon. Mr. TAYLOR: Yes, he volunteered his attendance there for the purpose of being asked.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: Yes, with other members of the Commons Committee. I pity my honourable friend's state of mind.

Hon. Mr. TAYLOR: There will be something else to pity by and by.

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: Colonel Ralston entered the Committee room and was sitting there, and, so far as I know, saw then for the first time the section which we had had prepared to take the place of section 25. It was submitted to him and he read it over and discussed it with those who were sitting around him. Then—since we are discussing what happened in Committee—I myself asked him one or two questions in connection with the clause, and he said that, without having had the time to digest it at all, speaking for himself, he thought it looked as if it might be a reasonably good clause. That is, I think, as far as he went. He emphasized the fact that he had not had time to digest the clause and that he was speaking for himself.

I think it important that I should concur with the honourable the Chairman of that Committee (Hon. Mr. Calder) in protecting, in his absence, this Minister who came to the