

Q. 3. Did he complain that his left leg also began to bother him when doing heavy lifting, the muscles becoming tired and locked?

A. There is no record of complaints on this subject at this time.

Q. 4. Does he complain that his leg condition is still with him?

A. There is complaint of some weakness of the left leg in January, 1948.

Q. 5. Was he given a one-man board by Dr. Whitelaw in July, 1944, and x-rayed, and subsequently classed as A-1 physically fit?

A. Dr. Whitelaw examined Connorton and made a "consultant's report" on the 10th January, 1945. In this report Connorton was pronounced fit for duty. X-rays were taken about this time.

Q. 6, 7, 8.—

6. Did he subsequently complain to another departmental doctor, a Dr. Prior, that his spine was still bothering him?

7. Did Dr. Prior state that he would charge him with "malingering" if he complained again?

8. Was he also examined by other departmental doctors at the Givenchy barracks, Victoria, B.C., and did they say there was nothing wrong with him?

A. There is no evidence available about these allegations.

C. Third list of questions, page 5432, column 1. These questions refer to a period during which the man was serving with the armed forces. Complete answers in detail are therefore not possible in all cases at this time.

Q. 1. Was Connorton examined by Dr. Ross Robertson, neurosurgeon, Shaughnessy hospital, Vancouver, B.C., and did that physician allege the man had an immature spine?

A. Connorton was examined by Dr. Ross Robertson on the 9th November, 1945. No mention is made of an "immature spine" in this report.

Q. 2. Did Dr. Ross Robertson tell the man he would need as remedial treatment a spinal fusion operation to knit the spine?

A. Dr. Ross Robertson recommended spinal fusion.

Q. 3. (page 5433, first column) Was Connorton given a spinal fusion operation on November 15, 1945?

A. Yes.

Q. 4. Did the man lose the use of his toes in the left leg as a result of this operation?

A. No record.

Q. 5. Has subsequent remedial treatment for the toes proved ineffective?

A. Remedial treatment for weakness of the left leg has proved effective and on discharge from treatment 19th January, 1948, it was reported that there is no restriction of the movements of the left leg. This report states that the man has made good progress.

Q. 6. Was he subsequently examined in the Shaughnessy hospital, Vancouver, B.C., by the neurosurgeons, Doctors Boucher, Naden, Starr, Thompson and Black?

A. He was examined in Shaughnessy hospital by Dr. Black, and was referred to Dr. Stanley, psychiatrist.

Q. 7. Did these neurosurgeons turn him over to Dr. Stanley, departmental psychiatrist, and did Dr. Stanley state that there was nothing wrong with the man except in his imagination?

A. Dr. Stanley examined Connorton on the 21st May, 1946, on reference by Dr. Black. There is no suggestion in Dr. Stanley's report that there was nothing wrong with the man except in his imagination.

Q. 8. Was the man then discharged from the Shaughnessy hospital without pension for his condition, and did he accept employment as a fireman in the engine room of the C.P.R. steamer *Princess Elaine*?

A. He was discharged from Shaughnessy hospital to Gordon Head convalescent centre on the 18th June, 1946, and discharged from Gordon Head the 18th September, 1946. Pension, awarded 10th May, 1947, was made effective from the 1st June, 1946. Connorton went to work on the C.P.R. *Princess Elaine*.

Q. 9. Was he compelled to give up this employment after two weeks on account of his back giving out?

A. The records state he worked for two months on the C.P.R. *Princess Elaine*.

D. List of questions on page 5433, column 1.

Q. 1. Was Connorton again admitted to Shaughnessy hospital on September 18, 1946, and subsequently given an exploratory operation by opening up the spine?

A. According to the records Connorton was admitted not the 18th September, 1946, but the 18th November, 1946. The subsequent operation was a second spinal fusion.

Q. 2. Was he in consequence given a second spinal fusion operation? If so, when?

A. Yes, on the 8th January, 1947.

Q. 3. Has the man stated he cannot face the operating table again because of the suffering he has undergone during these two operations and because his powers of resistance are now undermined?

A. There is no record of such a statement.

In that connection very serious charges were made against the psychiatric service of my department as follows:

1. Question—Has a psychiatrist in such a position as, say psychiatrist to Shaughnessy hospital, power to destroy utterly a veteran's chance for pension by simply reporting "this man is definitely neurotic"?

Answer—No, the psychiatrist is in no position to exert any such power.

The psychiatrist's sole function is to diagnose the present medical condition and to afford all medical treatment possible for it.

Under the Pension Act, the psychiatrist's report and all other available data is reviewed and on this basis, the degree to which the condition has been aggravated during service is assessed and determined.

2. Question—Can a key psychiatrist free the commission from the responsibility of furnishing either the applicant or his representative with a summary of evidence?

Answer—Section 61 of the Pension Act reads as follows:

"Subject to departmental regulations, the following persons may be permitted to inspect the records of the department and all material considered by the board of pension commissioners for Canada, the pension tribunal, the commission or an appeal board thereof, in disposing of any application for pension—