

*By Mr. Nickle:*

Q. It is difficult to set a scale for that type of case?—A. I do not know that it is. It is being done now. It should be an easy matter for a medical board to assess that man's disability at 25, 50, or 75 per cent.

Mr. SCOTT: You are getting right back to earning capacity when you do that. The difference is not the basis of what it should be awarded on, but if the man goes into some new occupation you instruct him. Your objection to the old method is, if he is able to earn more money his pension would immediately be reduced, and you want to avoid that. But you are not really avoiding that if it is fixed.

Colonel BELTON: Might I suggest that these questions be put to the President of the Pensions Board? I think Mr. Scammell is leading you astray.

The CHAIRMAN: We will take his evidence later on.

*By Hon. Mr. Oliver:*

Q. To get back to my question. It appears to me that when a man is disabled to the extent of requiring his discharge from military service, there is an important question as to whether he is entitled to consideration for that amount of disability or not. Whether or not, he is able to go back to civilian life, he has suffered disability. Under your proposal he is to receive compensation for that disability thereby suffered?—A. Certainly, he is.

*By the Chairman:*

Q. What would you say?—A. What disability has he suffered?

*By Mr. Nickle:*

Q. I will give you an instance, of a case I know of myself, of a despatch rider, who has had his heart dislocated. Take first the case that he was a labourer, and secondly that he was a clerk. There is the physical disability in each case.—A. I should put it upon the same basis.

Q. In one case it does not affect his ability to earn a living at all; in the other it does.—A. We would train him for some calling.

Q. You won't give him any pension if he can be trained in a new calling?—A. That I do not know. The question of pension will depend upon what the disability is.

Mr. SCOTT: The great objection is the first point. If you teach a man a certain vocation and then attempt to take away the pension, you take away the incentive to improve his condition. Once having specified the pension a man is to receive you cannot reduce it.

Hon. Mr. OLIVER: If it has been honestly granted.

The CHAIRMAN: If he has fulfilled the conditions entitling him to a pension.

Mr. SCOTT: That is a fundamental principle.

The CHAIRMAN: The principle is pretty much the same. A judge of the Supreme Court is entitled by law to a pension if he has served fifteen years; it is a legal right. He gets his pension, but that does not preclude him from practising law or going into parliament.

The WITNESS: But there is another side to that question which I think we should consider. There are two classes of injuries; there is a definite ascertainable injury which cannot be relieved by treatment. If I lose my leg, I shall never grow a new leg. There should be a definite pension which cannot be reduced in any way because of the loss of my leg. But if I have contracted rheumatism in addition to that, or some other internal complaint from which I am likely to recover, I do not think we should give a permanent pension for a complaint which is not permanent. Consequently, in cases of that kind, the pension should be subject to revision either once a year, or at such intervals as may be decided upon. My suggestion to this

[Mr. Scammell.]