

APPENDIX No. 2

By Mr. Nickle:

Q. How do you determine what we might call subjective disability, separated from actual disabilities?—A. That is only determinable by the capacity of the examiner to detect what is going on inside the individual, which comes by experience, I suppose, to a certain extent, but is very liable to error.

Q. Is there anything in the argument raised by these gentlemen representing the Veterans Association, that the central board should not vary the findings of the board that actually examined the man, because the central board is not able to estimate accurately the subjective conditions of the pensioner?—A. There is a good deal in that argument, but I think it is generally presumable that the Pension Board examiners are men of more wide experience and professional knowledge than the ordinary boards which are called upon to examine men in the first instance, which are oftentimes composed of men who by reason of their youth, have not had much experience in such matters.

Q. Then do I infer from what you say that the men who conduct the original examination are not as competent as they should be, or lack experience?—A. Oh, no, I think they must lack experience to a certain extent, compared with those who are older and longer in the profession; that is all. I do not think in any other respect there is any difference.

Q. There seems to be a universal complaint all over the country that the central board cuts down the allowances of the original examination board, and this is creating a great deal of discontent; I would like to know what is your opinion in regard to the whole matter?—A. My opinion is that the primary board is apt to be influenced by sympathy very much more than a board that does not see the man, and that the cold, calculating judgment of the revising board is more likely to be correct.

Q. Supposing a man says that he has a pain in the head, or a pain in his side, or that his chest aches, or something of that sort, how would the central board determine whether the man was telling the truth or not?—A. It would be impossible for them. All they could do would be to take the collateral evidence into consideration. That is all.

By Mr. Nesbitt:

Q. How would the examining board determine?—A. You can often get an impression of the truth or accuracy, or the lack of it, or of exaggeration, from a man's answers, and his behaviour.

Q. You just judge from your knowledge of human nature?—A. Quite so.

Q. And perhaps your former knowledge of the individual?—A. Yes, but we do not often have that in these cases.

By Mr. Pardee:

Q. Would it be much more satisfactory if those men appeared before you themselves?—A. Before the revising board?

Q. Yes?—A. I answered that question a while ago in the negative.

Q. You do not think it would be?—A. No; I mean to say they are liable to be influenced by the subjective symptoms, just as other examiners are. When the patient is absent, then they are merely bringing their judgment to bear upon it, not their sympathy.

Q. Do you think it would be better, or worse, that they should not appear?—A. I think it is better that they should not appear before the revising board.

Q. You do not think you could diagnose the case any better from seeing the subject himself, rather than merely the collateral evidence that you have?—A. That might be answered both ways, I think.

Q. In your own experience as a medical practitioner you would rather see the man yourself than have the man state his case to you on paper?—A. I would, certainly.