

## APPENDIX No. 4

*By Mr. Power:*

Q. Take the case of a pensioner who married subsequent to his discharge, and subsequent to being awarded a pension, do his children receive a pension?—A. He is on pension and has some children after he is on pension.

Q. Even though he gets married after discharge. They get a pension after his death?—A. No, I do not think they do,—nothing after his death.

Q. Why should the child of a man who is dying under similar circumstances be thrown upon the world—I am speaking of dying from other causes?

Mr. REDMAN: If he dies of disability they get a pension, do they not?

Mr. ARTHURS: I can bring up a case where a man died of his disability and could not get a pension.

The WITNESS: Married subsequent to his disability. This is not a ruling on my part, it is the Statute.

*By Mr. Arthurs:*

Q. Mr. Power asks the question, if a man marries subsequent to his discharge, a pensioner, do his children receive any pension?—A. Yes, allowances.

Q. If a man dies should that pension or allowance be discontinued?—Have you any reason for saying that?—A. I have no reason for saying one way or another, but that is the law, and if you admit that principle, you have to admit that anybody that is 99 per cent disabled—

Q. You keep on referring to 99 per cent disability?—A. I have to do so in order to illustrate the principle.

Q. I just ask you to drop that 99 per cent. In your judgment is it right that a man's children should receive a certain allowance provided he has an amputation below the knee? His children receive allowance, according to your statement. Am I correct?—A. Yes.

Q. Then if he dies, why should that allowance be discontinued?—A. He receives an allowance because he is supposed to be, by his injury, incapacitated, and therefore unable to earn his daily bread, that the other man will earn who is not incapacitated.

Q. He cannot earn it after he is dead?—A. I presume that is why it is given to him.

Mr. REDMAN: We have discussed this question before, and we will have to discuss it again. I do not see why Col. Thompson, who is purely an administrator, should be asked to give an opinion on the law which we ourselves will have to interpret.

Mr. NESBITT: I agree with that.

Mr. PECK: We want to know how to amend the law. If the law is all right, we may as well go back to our seats in the House of Commons. I think the point made by Colonel Arthurs is a most important one. I will mention a case which I came very closely in contact with, and it will open up a very important point. I had a sergeant in my battalion who rendered very important service in the war. He wished to return in the early part of 1919 to marry his fiancée but the stress of war at that time prevented him from doing so. He remained there from patriotism. He returned and was demobilized at Vancouver in 1919, some time about June or May. In two or three months' time he married his fiancée and two or three months later he died in considerable pain from a disease which he contracted. We find now that his wife is not entitled to receive any pension, nor his children. He was married after his discharge. That opens up a question that this Committee will have to deal with in regard to pensions. There is no doubt in the world but that man incurred that disease or aggravated that disease in service in the war and his wife cannot get a pension.

The WITNESS: That covers the case I was speaking of. My remedy for that would be insurance provided by the State at a reasonable rate.

[Col. Thompson].