

Q. If a man desires to be married, even though disabled actually or potentially, should he suffer for it?—A. I suppose that is what Parliament intended.

Q. What is your present opinion? Do you think the children should be entitled to a pension supposing he died from any disease? For instance, a man has lost a leg; his disability occurred before his marriage, yet he dies after marriage and has children subsequent to the date of his marriage?—A. I should think it would be a very dangerous sort of provision—a man with a hundred per cent disability when married—

Q. I am not talking about that?—A. The principle is the same.

Q. You grant pension to every child born subsequent to the injury in the case of a man who is a pensioner?—A. Yes.

Q. Why not follow that right through?—A. Married to a marriagable woman before he got his disability. There is no inducement then to marry a man who is dying.

Q. I am not asking you that question, but I am asking about a man with ordinary disabilities, a pensioner receiving a pension, regardless of whether he is ten or five per cent or anything else; he marries subsequent to his discharge. If he dies from any cause whatever, have you any reason to give why this man's children should not receive a pension as well as the children born under exactly similar circumstances to another pensioner who had been married previous to his discharge?—A. My own view is that the principle is the same, whether it is a small disability or a hundred per cent, and there is an inducement in the one case to marry a man—

Q. Your personal belief is that every obstacle should be placed in the way of a man marrying because he is under a degree of disability?—A. No, I do not.

Q. How do you reconcile the two propositions? No matter what the disability may be, whether five per cent or a hundred per cent, a man who has lost a leg below the knee—should he be debarred from marrying, or should he have the same chance as the man disabled after marriage?—A. I think if you admit the principle you speak of, you have to take the case of the hundred per cent man as well as the five per cent. You could not distinguish and say that the hundred per cent man should not receive it.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee considered that question on a former occasion, and the example of the United States was vividly before them, where an aged pensioner or a diseased pensioner was married deliberately almost on his deathbed, so that the widow and family if any might receive the pension. I think it is a matter for a committee to decide.

Mr. ARTHURS: I do not think it makes any difference, because we have, according to the figures given by Col. Thompson, about 70,000 pensioners. I am quite safe in saying that 60,000 of these men are very slightly disabled and you put an obstacle in the way of them marrying if they are not already married, because there may be cases of abuse—

The WITNESS: As a matter of fact, there is considerable hardship in that, because a large number of these men cannot get insurance, especially if the heart is affected, or if it is a mental case. It might be a slight wound in the head, but it is hard to get insurance.

*By Mr. Arthurs:*

Q. It does not make much difference whether the wound is in the head or the foot?—A. To the insurance company it does.

Q. He is still debarred from getting insurance at the ordinary rate?—A. It is practically prohibited.

Q. But still he is at liberty to insure?—A. Yes.

[Col. Thompson].