

(1)

## EXHIBIT No. 1.

*Submitted in connection with the Evidence of Mr. Frank Darling of Toronto.*

The amount of pensions as now shown in the existing Act is too low, especially as regards the man rendered totally incapable from illness contracted, or injuries received, while on service.

A totally incapacitated single man so injured that he is utterly incapable of earning a livelihood cannot possibly live on \$3.70 per week, which is the lowest for a man in the "second degree," nor on \$4.92 which is the highest. It is equally impossible on \$5.07, the lowest in the "first degree" or on \$6.77 which is the highest.

A married man equally wounded, with a wife and no children, is little, if at all, better off: \$6.20 per week, the lowest amount in the "second degree" or \$7.46 which is the highest: while the allowances even in the "first degree" do not much improve matters, the lowest being \$7.61, the highest \$9.31. There is, however, an allowance of \$5 per month for each child (roughly \$1.15 a week).

There is no use whatever in giving a totally incapacitated man a pension on which he is unable to live in ordinary decent comfort. Before enlisting it may be taken for granted that the vast majority were earning incomes sufficient to provide them with the ordinary necessities of life—why then should these same men returning to their homes, unable to pursue their former occupations owing to the injuries received while in the service of their country, be given incomes far less than they previously earned. It can be said without much fear of contradiction that the ordinary working man in this country should earn on the average \$12.50 a week—the unskilled day labourer somewhat less, the skilled mechanic a great deal more. On this amount a man and his wife can have a house of their own and can live fairly comfortably, though certainly not extravagantly.

In civil life no difference is made between the wages paid to single and married men; they get the same amount of money for the same work. Why therefore should there be any difference made in the amount of their pension? A totally incapacitated man who has a wife would receive from her the care and attention for which an unmarried man would have to pay and which it would be impossible for him to get for the small amount of money he would be able to spare out of his \$12.50. On anything less indeed than this amount it is difficult to see what the single man could do if he were without arms or legs, hopelessly crippled or paralysed. It would be impossible for him to get a boarding house keeper to lodge and feed him and give him the constant attendance which would be necessary for a man in his condition. Practically every boarding house to which he might apply would report they were full and had no room for him.

If, however, he were given the same income as the married man he might marry and set up a home of his own and be a better man and better citizen in consequence. When he died, of course, his widow would not be entitled to a pension nor would any children that happened to be born of the marriage. To reduce this \$12.50 in the smallest degree would practically condemn him to celibacy and a cheap boarding house for the rest of his natural life.

The pension, which the country will provide for soldiers returning home wounded in the service of the Empire must be paid them not as a charity but as a debt honourably and heroically earned. The measure of its discharge therefore should be, not the least we can do, but the most we can afford.

It is somewhat difficult to understand the constant reference to, and comparison with, the pension allowance made by other countries, it sounds as though it was some defence, to urge that if our rates are low, theirs are lower. What has that to do with the case? The men whom our pension fund will succor have lived, and will live in Canada, not in New Zealand, Australia or England. Surely we are capable of settling for ourselves without reference to other countries what amount of money is