

## APPENDIX No. 4

inclined to favour the United States way of an annual fixed amount for the loss of a leg or an arm. Then you would have to provide otherwise for disabilities arising from disease and illness. If, on the other hand, the present arrangement is continued, I certainly do think that the rates should be increased.

*By the Chairman:*

Q. All of the rates? How about the rates for officers?—A. Yes. If the rates for officers are not increased they should certainly not be reduced as proposed in Mr. Darling's report, and especially the rates in the totally incapacitated class. It has always seemed to me that \$264 a year is too little. You engage a man at \$1.10 a day. If he is totally disabled while in your service surely you ought at least to give him that same rate of \$1.10 a day; but as it is now the rate is \$264 a year.

*By the Chairman:*

Q. You think there should be a difference between the officers' rate and that of the rank and file in the amount of pension paid, even under conditions in this country? Take this case: Two brothers enlist, one is a commissioned officer, and the other in the ranks. If the commissioned officer is injured, he would receive more pension than his brother who is a private?—A. I would treat them according to their rank.

Q. If they were both married, and they are brothers occupying the same social station in life, you say that the widow of the one who is an officer should get larger pension than the widow of the one who is a private, although they are both accustomed to the same scale of living?—A. From the military point of view, we consider them according to their rank, and not according to their former civilian position in life.

Q. I can understand in the regular army distinctions being drawn. But you don't think there is a marked difference in the case of a volunteer army such as we are sending over?—A. No, sir. All should be paid and widows pensioned according to the rank held by their deceased husbands.

*By Mr. Nickle:*

Q. Do you think the fellows who jumped in at the beginning should not get as large a pension as the men who later on went as officers?—A. I do not see how you can distinguish.

Q. Why not?

Mr. MACDONELL: I do not think you should make them equal.

The CHAIRMAN: In the regular forces I can see why there should be the distinction, but it is a little more difficult to justify the case of a volunteer army. Volunteers are generally better educated, and often come from better social conditions than men in the regular forces. I wanted to get the opinion of military men about it.

*By Mr. Macdonell:*

Q. I understand that you have a comparative statement or table?—A. I have not a more recent one than appears in the blue-book.

Mr. MACDONELL: You compare Canada's scale with Australia, New Zealand, Great Britain and the United States.

Mr. MACDONALD: Mr. Darling has prepared a memo. of the comparisons that Mr. Macdonell speaks about, from his viewpoint. It is very comprehensive, and is the most easily comprehended analysis I have seen.

The CHAIRMAN: We will have this statement of Mr. Darling's printed as an exhibit. (See Exhibit 1.)

*By Mr. Macdonell:*

Q. Colonel Dunbar, what are the dates of the adoption of the pensions in the other countries you compared Canada with?—A. I am sorry I cannot say, sir.