

bly be presumed to have existed from the date of entitlement, insofar as the disability has not already been included in the assessment of a pensionable condition.

Mr. CARTER: I would like to ask why the date of 1st January, 1965, was chosen, because the Act does permit the Commission to go back I think as far as three years, to make a pension retroactive for three years, does it not?

Dr. RICHARDSON: In considering an effective date for this special disability, there were several considerations and one is that it was desired to choose a date which could be used for all veterans alike—common date for awards made under the terms of this recommendation.

If the recommendation had been simply that Section 31 be used to the full extent, the man whose file was reviewed in February would receive preferential treatment over the one reviewed in June. Rightly or wrongly, we felt that it was better that all veterans be treated alike, whether their surname starts with A or Z and whether their file is reached early or late in the review. January 1st, 1965, appeared to be the most suitable date to make this possible with a reasonable length of retroactivation of the award.

Mr. CHATTERTON: Mr. Anderson, when is it anticipated that this review will be completed?

Mr. ANDERSON: We have not anticipated any particular date at the moment. I would hope that the bulk of it would be completed during the current year but, as was pointed out earlier under the comments here, there are some instances where this will go on indefinitely because there will be new claims arising in connection with certain aspects of this report, which will have to be dealt with as and when they arise. So that the effect of this report will continue on indefinitely.

Mr. CHATTERTON: A complete review of all these cases will have been completed possibly by the end of this year?

Mr. ANDERSON: We certainly hope to be able to do that, yes.

Mr. CHATTERTON: Well then, if the retroactive date had been the 1st of January, 1964, rather than 1965, then you would have had a more similar application to Section 31, which would be two years.

Mr. CARTER: I would like to follow up a supplementary. With respect to Dr. Richardson's answer. I cannot see how you would not be treating veterans all alike, if you chose the 1st of January, 1964, instead of the 1st of January, 1965. The only difference is the date.

Dr. RICHARDSON: I did not mention all the considerations that led to this recommendation and it might be difficult for me to recall them at the moment. I have already mentioned the fact that many of the men who have a known peptic ulcer have been receiving both treatment and disability pension for the symptoms. Because they were described they were placed on the record long before the diagnosis of peptic ulcer was made. There is, therefore, not as much significance, financial or otherwise, in a long period of retroactivation of entitlement as might at first appear.