

By the Chairman:

Q. I regard this as an important point and it will come up directly when we come to consider the present Act and the amendments to this Act. It is a matter for the Committee to decide; if it was decided in one way by a former committee that is no reason why it should not be altered.

Mr. ARTHURS: Another committee of this House has decided to recommend that insurance should be granted by the Government at the ordinary rate.

Mr. NESBITT: We recommend that the Government should investigate.

WITNESS: There is no doubt that a man is very seriously handicapped when he comes back with such a disability as Colonel Peck has spoken about.

The CHAIRMAN: I think it would be fairer to us to say that we consider you an expert and would like to have your opinion, but we cannot compel you to express an opinion unless you desire to do so.

By Mr. Arthurs:

Q. Have you had many complaints along this line suggested by myself and Colonel Peck? Has your Department had many complaints?—A. Quite a number, but they are put up to us in the shape of hardship cases.

Mr. CLARK: The point taken is that the infection was received after discharge and the Department could not be responsible, and I do not think that Colonel Thompson or any other witness should be asked to express an opinion.

By Mr. Arthurs:

Q. Another question on a different line; have you had many complaints as to the inadequacy of the proportionate amount of pension to a man? That is, we will say, regarding a man who is an amputation case, a leg off below the knee, I think it is 25 per cent?—A. I cannot say definitely offhand as to the percentage.

Q. Have you had any complaints that this was inadequate?—A. I would say no to that question. The largest number of complaints we have is from men receiving \$2, \$5 or \$6 a month. They do not complain that their disability is greater than the medical branch have awarded them, but they say "I want a little more money to get tobacco," and so on. My opinion is that no man with a 20 per cent disability is earning any less money than a sound man, but the number of positions open to him might be less and in a congested state of society he would not be earning every day.

Q. As a matter of fact many of our men who came back injured were men without any education, probably ordinary workingmen, and a man suffering the loss of a limb might be quite capable to work during the summer months, but during the winter months he is badly handicapped?—A. I see your point. I think, theoretically, the 20 per cent man is earning less money, but practically he gets into an occupation with steady employment.

Q. Provided he has education, that does not make a difference?—A. No doubt they are in an elevator, or whatever his occupation is.

By Mr. Clark:

Q. In connection with this disability of 5 per cent, most of the claims are from men with small disabilities, they have a small pension, and they are desirous of drawing the whole amount, instead of receiving it by the month?—A. They can do so if they like.

Q. How many have availed themselves of that opportunity?—A. I have not the details here, but in many cases they say they have not received their cheque for the first payment and they want it sent monthly.

Q. I think it will be a fair question to ask the witness if he has any solution to suggest as to the best way to deal with these low disability case complaints?—A. I made the suggestion that under the circumstances we might take the pension that the man would be entitled to and pay him a lump sum according to his disability.

[Col. Thompson].