

APPENDIX No. 2

Q. Take the case of a man who was affected by a disease and ten or twelve years ago made a reasonable recovery, and was apparently cured, and then by reason of exposure and malnutrition while on service the manifestations returned, would you consider that as a disability entitling him to a pension?—A. No, we should not.

Q. How do you justify that position?—A. You would have to ask the medical men how it is justified. But I understand that the disease from which that man suffered nearly always goes straight ahead. The disease is sure at some time or other to show itself.

Q. I have had a number of cases brought to my attention and a great many men have spoken to me in regard to this matter. This disease is to an extent controllable, and if a man had it there might not be anything to indicate its presence. It has become latent, and it is quite possible to complete the normal life without its disclosing itself. But because of malnutrition, exposure, or anything that overtaxes him, it may become active and many men show tertiary manifestations under those circumstances. In a good many cases men have enlisted not knowing that there were the latent forms of the disease present, they have gone to the front and have broken down, the tertiary manifestations have disclosed themselves, and the men have been refused pensions, with the result that the dependents upon them have been placed in very difficult circumstances. The man who has left home in good health apparently has come back a total wreck. If he had never enlisted he might have lived the normal life. I think in that case he is entitled to consideration, and I wanted to get from Mr. Archibald for the record what the policy is with regard to the men who had disease prior to enlistment under the circumstances I have related?—A. The policy is to grant a very small pension in consideration of possible aggravation or to grant no pension at all.

Q. What is your suggestion as to how a man's wife and family should be kept in such cases?—A. I do not think it is reasonable they should be kept at the expense of the Federal Government if the Federal Government did not cause the man's disability.

Q. Assuming that it would never have occurred if he had not gone to the front, what then?—A. If the service did cause the disability, then we must look after the man.

Q. Even if this particular disease were at the root of it?—A. Yes.

Q. Assuming that the man did not have the disease before he went overseas, and came back a total wreck, would you consider that improper conduct?—A. That is clearly improper conduct, and we are continually refusing pensions to men suffering from disease of that nature when acquired in England or elsewhere.

Q. Assuming that if there had been proper treatment given him after the contraction of the disease it would have cured him, but that he was unable to get it, on account of war conditions, what would you say then?—A. The mere fact that you are unable to give a man treatment has nothing to do with it; he has been guilty of improper conduct, and when that is the case there should not be any pension, no matter what the subsequent result might be.

By Mr. Nesbitt:

Q. But in all cases of sickness, treatment is given the man?—A. The men are always given treatment in case of sickness. There are a great many differences of opinion even among medical men on this question.

By Mr. Nickle:

Q. May there not be cases where men have contracted disease without any contributory action on their own part?—A. There may be a few cases. We had a case the other day where we pensioned a man for the loss of an eye; he was sleeping with a man who had a disease, which he knew nothing of. He got some germs into his eye, and as a consequence he lost the eye. We pensioned him for the loss of the eye, but it was not his fault, he was not guilty of any improper conduct.

[Mr. Kenneth Archibald.]