

Both the Woods Committee and the White Paper issued by the Department of Veterans Affairs recognized the special and additional requirements of those suffering from severe or multiple disabilities. Accordingly, your Committee recommends that additional payments be made to certain categories of veterans whose eligibility would be determined by regulation, in the categories of multiple or severe disabilities. These additional payments should be paid as a matter of right, and should be on a scale higher than that suggested in the White Paper. The details of your Committee's recommendations are set out under Recommendations 64 and 65.

Your Committee was also concerned about the ceiling of \$3,000 now applying to attendance allowances. No changes have been made in these maximum amounts since 1964. In view of the increasing costs of these services, we recommend that these be reviewed by the Government.

Your Committee also spent considerable time reviewing the appeal procedures suggested on the one hand by the White Paper and on the other hand by the Veterans' Associations, which were essentially modifications and extensions of the Woods recommendations. We were very much concerned about the principle of an independent review board being stacked on top of an independent Pension Commission. This appeared to us to raise a fundamental question of public administration, but the representations by the Veterans' Associations were strong, persistent and undeviating on this point. In the circumstances, we are recommending that the procedure essentially recommended by the Veterans' Associations in the final hearings in April of this year should be adopted with some modification. The particulars of your Committee's recommendations are contained in Recommendation 14.

Your Committee has reservations, however, concerning the observations of the Veterans' Associations on the ability of the Canadian Pension Commission to delegate responsibility to field staff and also on the suggestion that a single Commissioner should be able to make decisions. In our opinion, decisions should be signed by more than one Commissioner in the interests of uniformity of administration.

Without delegation to field staff and to one Commissioner, your Committee doubts if 12 Commissioners would be able to cope with the workload. It considers that, during the first two or three years of the operation of the Pension Review Board, if there is no delegation as proposed, it may be necessary to appoint additional *ad hoc* Commissioners and supporting staff.

It is impossible at this time to foresee the operations of the Pension Review Board with any degree of certainty or to forecast with any accuracy the number of claims which will come before the Board and the Commission for adjudication in the future. Your Committee therefore suggests that the organization, establishment and procedure of both the Review Board and the Commission be reviewed after five years. For these reasons your Committee considers that appointment of Commissioners for a specific term is preferable to a life appointment.

Recommendation is made (Woods Recommendation 106) to pay pension to widows of pensioners who were being paid at rates of 48% or less.

Finally, we were concerned with the principles behind the suggestion for automatic age increases. These were considered at some length, but the Committee was unable to accept the recommendations of the Veterans' Associations in this area.