

APPENDIX No. 4

The WITNESS: Your present pension gives a grant for special attendance of \$7.33 per month. What sort of attendance can you hire for that?

Hon. Mr. OLIVER: You cannot do it.

The WITNESS: The married man gets nothing for his wife if you fix the scale at \$12.50 a week. He and his wife, even if he is badly injured, can live on that because he has no children, and she can look after her husband. If a single man is disabled, there is not a boardinghouse in the town that will take him in; he cannot attend to himself, he may not even be able to get his clothes on and off. Even at \$12.50 a week, he would have the greatest trouble in the world living. One man might be able to live on this amount, and another would not; you would have to average it. If you take anything off the \$12.50, he cannot live at all.

Mr. MACDONALD: That is if totally incapable, you must remember that fact.

Mr. NESBITT: That is the basis he starts on.

By Hon. Mr. Oliver:

Q. I cannot see the fairness of putting the man who does not require an attendant on the same footing as the man who does require one. The man who is blind, or has no legs or arms, must have attendance?—A. If you put in that special attendance, you will find yourself in more trouble than if you adopted my scheme. It is pretty hard to say what attendance a man gets. A man who needs a little attendance should not get as much as the man who needs a great deal. The American scale gives for full attendance \$100 a month, and for partial attendance \$75 a month. For full attendance a man can hire a regular certified professional nurse, who looks after him all the time.

Q. Hardly?—A. Yes, he can. There is no sense in offering \$7.33 a month. You might as well leave out the whole thing altogether.

Hon. Mr. OLIVER: I am not defending the present arrangement. But your proposed arrangement does not seem to me to be altogether equitable.

Mr. MACDONALD: We are starting with the totally disabled class. The question is whether \$12.50 is sufficient for the totally incapable. A totally incapable man must require somebody to look after him.

Hon. Mr. OLIVER: He is totally incapable of earning a livelihood.

By the Chairman:

Q. Suppose a man was a stenographer, and lost one hand. He can still take care of himself?—A. With one hand he can learn lots of things.

The CHAIRMAN: It would depend upon the man.

Hon. Mr. OLIVER: There are two conditions of disability, one applying to earning power, and the disability of personal attention. The man who is so disabled as to require assistance for personal attention is surely in a different position.

The CHAIRMAN: Take the case of a man who is blind.

The WITNESS: A blind man does not require constant attention. They are one of the easiest classes to deal with. A friend of mine recently visited St. Dunstan's House, in London, established for the instruction of the blind, and tells that he never saw anything more cheerful or delightful. It is wonderful to see what blind men can do. They are raising chickens, they kill them, they dress them, and prepare them for market. They have learned it since the war, and this occupation is only one of many.

Mr. NESBITT: They have been able to do wonderful things in the United States with blind men.

Hon. Mr. OLIVER: That means the establishment of institutions, which is another question that interlocks with this.