

6-7 GEORGE V, A. 1916

Q. I am not speaking merely of the medical phase?—A. Instances have come to me. Take a man with a bad heart, suffering from cardiac for example; at first he is not so bad, he probably grows worse. In five or six years that man is almost incapable. It is very hard on him to say that after five years he should be trying to live on something like \$10 a month.

Q. Would a medical man not take that into consideration?—A. That I do not know. There seems to me to be illnesses, rather than wounds, that are progressive, and a very little pension makes a man satisfied at first; but it is hard luck if a man, four years afterwards, is not capable of earning a livelihood.

Mr. NESBITT: His case should be reviewed.

The WITNESS: That is why I feel cases should be reviewed.

By Mr. Nesbitt:

Q. And the scale should go up, not down?—A. Up, not down. The downward review does not work. They found that out in France. The men discovered that the harder they worked the smaller was their pension, and the less they worked the more they got. You ought to review upwards.

By the Chairman:

Q. There will be interminable trouble if you do not settle it finally?—A. You are speaking now where the case is not subject to review?

The CHAIRMAN: You are suggesting that it should be reviewed.

By Mr. Macdonald:

Q. I want to get this thing in a logical form if I can. Your view is that you would obliterate the distinction between the first and second degrees altogether. If a man is incapable he would be entitled to a pension. Outside of that class, you say the pension should be a sliding scale, to be determined by a Board, having regard to the present and future disabilities of the soldier. Following that on, would you say, in regard to the capability, what amount of pension should be given?—A. About \$54 a month or \$12.50 a week. From all I can learn—I happen to know many mechanics and workmen, both in the country and in the town, and I asked them, what they thought a fair rate was; I took the Labour Department's scale of the cost of living in this country—their figures fluctuate; they are higher now than last year—and on the whole I came to the conclusion that \$12.50 a week seemed to be a fair amount.

Q. For a private?—A. Yes.

By the Chairman:

Q. Would you increase the amount if the man had a wife?—A. I would give exactly the same thing, but extra for children.

Q. Not for the wife?—A. No.

By Hon. Mr. Oliver:

Q. Would that amount include services of an attendant?—A. I would not make any arrangement at all, but have one fixed figure of \$54 a month, whether he has a wife or not. I would give it to a single man, and to a married man with a wife and no children. I would make an extra grant if there are children.

Q. There is a vast difference between the man who requires an attendant and one who does not?—A. His wife can give him the necessary attendance.

Hon. Mr. OLIVER: But if he has no wife?

Mr. NESBITT: He can hire attendance.

Hon. Mr. OLIVER: If he can hire attendance, then he is getting too much.

[Mr. Darling.]