

REPORT
OF
ROYAL COMMISSION

Appointed to Investigate Charges
of Political Partisanship in the
Department of Soldiers' Civil
Re-establishment.



OTTAWA
F. A. ACLAND
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1928

REPORT OF ROYAL COMMISSION APPOINTED TO INVESTIGATE
CHARGES OF POLITICAL PARTISANSHIP IN THE DEPART-
MENT OF SOLDIERS' CIVIL RE-ESTABLISHMENT

To His EXCELLENCY

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL IN COUNCIL:

IN THE MATTER of a Commission dated 30th day of June, 1927, to Alfred Taylor Hunter, under Part I of the Inquiries Act, Chapter 104 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, to investigate charges of political partisanship in the service of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment at Toronto, London, and Ottawa.

I have the honour to report as follows:

The commission in this matter was issued to me as of June 30 last. The actual sittings began at Toronto on July 14, and the inquiry has been proceeding with such despatch as circumstances and counsel have permitted. I did not encourage counsel to sum up verbally but set a period within which they could file written arguments. These arguments have been very helpful in the task of analysing the evidence. Needless to say counsel, following the habits of the profession, have taken their time to file their arguments. I received the latest of these for the defence on December 14.

Mr. Alex. MacGregor presented the evidence of the complainants and seven learned counsel exerted their talents for the defence. Under the circumstances it is not surprising that I have been unable to close the work of the commission at as early a date as I had hoped.

The inquiry has been held in camera in view of the fact that matters of this sort sometimes excite persons of unstable mental balance to make against officials statements that on examination prove so ill-founded that it would be unreasonable to ask the officials to show cause. In such cases it would be a hardship to the officials and bad for departmental discipline to subject them to a barrage of newspaper head-lines. If on the other hand it is found necessary to report against an official, what he will experience will no doubt be sufficient without unnecessary publicity.

Some of the counsel have criticized the holding of the inquiry in camera and several of them have commended it. I think most of the officials are thankful.

Since entering on the inquiry over a hundred complainant witnesses have come forward to give evidence, complaining mostly of political partisanship but incidentally revealing other matters that require some considerable attention. These witnesses have been of quite varied calibre, ranging from candidates for Parliament to quite humble clerks and from distinguished physicians and surgeons to hospital attendants.

The procedure requires that complaints be in writing. Before the issue of the commission a large number of affidavits of complainants had been received and I have followed this line in each new case of complaint; and needless to say a good many complaints did not seem fairly within the scope of the inquiry, and have not been taken up.

The usual attempts of lawyers to dictate a hard and fast procedure such as pertains to a law-suit have been resisted. The value of the Inquiries Act would be nullified if precedents were created requiring the investigation to swing into the rut of a formal procedure as at Osgoode Hall. In this respect proceedings under the Inquiries Act resemble those of coroner.

In this inquiry cross-examination of witnesses, other than by the commissioner has been eliminated. This was done for three reasons:

First, as there were eleven persons who appeared sufficiently involved to be required to defend themselves, cross-examination would have resulted in something like a dozen long drawn out law-suits.

Second, cross-examination is alien to all the procedure of the D.S.C.R. No veteran seeking pension or treatment has been allowed the right of cross-examining the medical or other evidence on which his case has been decided. If cross-examination is necessary to get justice for an official trying to hold his job it would be much more necessary in the case of a veteran whose future and that of his dependants may depend on the decision made. So if the commissioner is held wrong in this matter of cross-examination, then every rejected veteran should be allowed to cross-examine the doctors and others who reported unfavourably to his claim.

Third, in this instance the place of cross-examination is taken by the production of files. Every veteran as well as every employee has a file. So if John Doe complains that something was done to him in March, 1923, then his file is produced showing with great precision all the things that have been done to John Doe and when and why. This is much more definite evidence than could ever be got by cross-examining John Doe.

Before leaving the matter of these files I wish to point out that their value would be much increased if they were properly paged in some distinctive handwriting. Recently some of the staff files have been paged faintly with a numbering machine; which of course is valueless as a preventive against substitution. Generally speaking the files of the department are not paged and might be added to, pruned or plundered with impunity.

To the files produced by the head office officials at Ottawa were added summaries which might have been of service in reducing fatigue, if I had found them to have been prepared in a spirit of candour and fairness. On examining some of them I found this spirit not present. The evidence of some of the complainants had a tendency to go far afield. I did not curb this for the reason that I suspected there were other and perhaps bigger causes of unrest than partisan activity. I felt that the more the actual life in the department was revealed the better able I should be to get things in correct proportion. In an investigation of this sort—limited to complaints of one kind—there might be a tendency to take things that belonged on other counters and pile them all on the counter of political discrimination. This expansiveness of the complainants' evidence led to very minute evidence in rebuttal by the officials complained of. The total result is that the evidence will be a mine of historical and statistical information for the Minister and all others who may be interested.

One value of it to me is that I have felt able to decide whether in a specific instance the grievance complained of was due to politics or to something totally different.

One cause of unrest and dissatisfaction that cannot be said to be political is the simple but cruel fact that the staff of the D.S.C.R. has been reduced from about ten thousand in 1920 to a present strength of less than two thousand. It was inevitable that many of those let out would feel that conspicuous merit went unrecognized and that their detachment from the department was due to some malignant influence. The official who will admit that his release is a proper and reasonable administrative act is I believe a philosopher rare in the Canadian public service.

Another cause of unrest—to which I shall refer again—is the equivocal position of the employee of the D.S.C.R. with respect to the Civil Service regulations. Rather prematurely, I feel, the salaries and classification of the D.S.C.R. have been made to conform to the regulations of the Civil Service Commission. But the one advantageous inducement for submitting to such a

classification—a scheme of superannuation—has been indefinitely held up. The classification of the Civil Service Commission is necessarily a rough attempt towards equality; as it has to apply to a great many Government departments. Like an army boot, it does not quite fit anyone but can be made to do. I think it was premature to apply this to a department like the D.S.C.R., that was changing its plans of operation sometimes several times in a year and where any given man's duties might be continually expanding and contracting.

As things have turned out the employees have hitherto had all the disadvantages of being brought under the Civil Service classification—in many cases resulting in a demotion in pay—and have had no advantages whatever.

Another cause of discontent and of a bitterness to which any political animosity that I have discovered in the department is as a honeycomb, compared with a gall-bladder, is the unhappy amalgamation attempted between the officials and employees of the Board of Pension Commission and those of the D.S.C.R. The complaints of political partisanship seem like birthday compliments compared with the amenities that travel between the learned physicians that maintain one or other side of this ancient feud between the Pension Board doctors and the D.S.C.R. doctors. I shall refer to this matter again. But I think the greatest source of unrest and mental disturbance has been the general atmosphere of uncertainty and mystery that has pervaded the whole department. This is particularly dangerous where the department is manned by ex-soldiers. In the Army part of the training of a recruit is not only to teach him his duties but also to teach his rights, what he is entitled to, how to ask for it, how to complain, and generally the system of military organization and how he is expected to fit into it.

The system followed in the D.S.C.R. seems the exact opposite of the army system. Nobody except a few of the higher officials at Headquarters, Ottawa, seems to have any definite information.

For instance there is what is known as classification. Among all the junior officials this matter, which virtually affects every employee's pay and promotion, was a very nebulous proposition. Some of the witnesses had heard of a board of classification. But until I asked Mr. Scammel, the Assistant Deputy Minister, I could not correctly learn the personnel of this board; until I asked Mr. Parkinson, the Deputy Minister, I could not get an accurate definition of the functions and limitations of the Board; and until I asked Mr. Stewart, the Assistant Secretary, I could get no clear statement of the principles on which the employees are graded and their salaries adjusted.

The same uncertainty exists in other matters and it is not surprising that in some instances witnesses involved in this fog of administration and complaining of injustice lay it on the doorstep of political partisanship because no other likely reason presents itself.

I was struck with this helpless vagueness in much of the complainant evidence taken at Ottawa. Several of the witnesses were what I call "furtive Liberals" who until the issue of this commission had successfully dissembled their politics even from their desk-mates.

But generally in all places the organization seemed to be badly illuminated. This is not due to lack of Orders in Council and regulations. The quantity of these is cleverly satirized by one of the witnesses, Mr. Myers of the Amputation Association, and has become rather a standing jest with both officials and veterans generally. The natural result of this quantity is that huge volumes are bound up of these orders and regulations which few people have the industry to consult and very much fewer have the pretension to understand.

In fact the D.S.C.R. presents to most of its employees less a definite (and sometimes terribly definite) organization such as they were used to in the army than some Asiatic mystery or complex conspiracy.

It has been more than once pointed out by counsel for the defence as something incredible that the alleged partisan acts against Liberals have taken place under a Liberal minister and a Liberal administration. The explanation is simple.

The more noticeable partisan troubles began immediately following the general election in 1921. Prior to that time a Union Government was in power which had appointed a number of Liberals to the service in this department. As the then leader of the Union Government was anxious to retain as much Liberal support as possible any action taken to oust these Liberal employees would obviously have been bad politics. But the campaign in 1921 proved conclusively that the alliance was at an end and that there was no further likelihood of Liberal support for the Right Hon. Mr. Meighen's party. That Conservative officials could have the audacity to act oppressively to Liberal subordinates is due to the absolute but ill-requited confidence reposed in his departmental advisors by the then minister the Hon. Dr. Beland.

I started the investigation with complaints arising in D Unit, Toronto. The examination of the party candidates who had an electoral interest in Christie Street Hospital as part of their constituency brought out little beyond the fact that they were invariably in receipt of reports from their workers that it was not advisable to expect anything from the hospital as it was organized in the Conservative interest. They did not appear prepared to cite specific instances of partisan activity in elections, merely a smoky atmosphere.

As illustrating the density of this atmosphere there is the episode of the Newmarket raid. This was an essay in political filibustering on the eve of the general election in 1925, by which two large motor buses were to load up at Christie Street Hospital with patients and orderlies and proceed to Newmarket for the purpose of breaking up Right Hon. Mackenzie King's meeting. The organization for this expedition was so impudent in its widespread openness that the plot leaked out to the Liberals and was squelched by peremptory telegrams from Ottawa, reminding officials of the consequences of active partisanship.

It is of course impossible to connect any of the higher officials with this buccaneering project; but that its movers so confidently based their operations upon Christie Street Hospital gives one a fair idea of the density of the Tory atmosphere of the place.

The reading of the Ottawa telegram by Colonel Morrison to the two hundred or two hundred and fifty employees present had a curious sequel:

Colonel Morrison in amplifying the telegram used an expression, "This Government may change to-morrow." A Liberal—Mr. Graham Smith—interjected, "It may not." There does not seem to me any very good reason why Colonel Morrison should have placed any emphasis on this interjection. Nevertheless for some reason he showed himself sensitive and had Graham Smith before him next morning to discuss it. His treatment of Smith was quite bland and courteous and Smith left his presence with a very favourable opinion of the Colonel.


Let us continue in Smith's own language: "I had the impression when I left the office that he was a good head, that he never said nothing to me; but during the same day I was called into J. D. Anderson's office and there I had to give account for about a year's 'lates' back, that I really had and I put a bit of an argument about having to account for those 'lates' which had excuses really been given for them. I told him right straight that he didn't pull this off with every other person."

The suddenness of this transition at once warned Smith that Colonel Morrison was "riding" him. This "riding" did not quite end with Colonel Morrison and Mr. J. D. Anderson; but W. J. Young, of the Limb Factory, also took a turn at Smith, the very same day. Certainly his little interruption "It may not" produced some remarkable echoes.

Colonel Morrison of course with his customary virginal innocence of all politics says he had no communication with J. D. Anderson (a Conservative) or W. J. Young (a Conservative) in this matter. To my mind two coincidences in one day are too many: the facts point to a bit of Conservative team-play.

The organization in force in this—D Unit of the D.S.C.R.—comprises an Administration Branch headed by Lt.-Col. G. F. Morrison, Unit Director of Administration, and a Medical Branch headed by Dr. S. R. D. Hewitt, Unit Medical Director, under whom is the Superintendent of the Hospital itself, Dr. McMane, and for purposes not very clearly defined, Dr. Roy Coutts, who is in charge of the division work in the unit for the Board of Pension Commissioners.

The following is a rough chart showing the chain of responsibility reaching from H.Q. at Ottawa to D Unit, Toronto. Other units are somewhat similarly organized.



I have called on three officials in the Administrative Branch for their defence: Colonel Morrison, the Unit Director of Administration, his deputy, Mr. Harry Young, and Mr. J. D. Anderson who is head of the General Division. These form a chain of responsibility in certain acts complained of as partisan.

When it came to the examination of employees present and past of this branch the complaints became both quite specific and quite numerous. It was not the odd case of the temperamental fellow who has kicked himself out of a job or of the honest elector who being released for cause suddenly discovers himself to have been a life-long Liberal.

It has been steadily forced on my attention that there is by these employees believed to have been a system at work during the last six years which has been operating for the remorseless attrition of the Liberal employees of the department.

Each of the three officials named vehemently denies any partisan zeal and claims an almost impossible ignorance of politics generally; and in particular of the individual politics of their subordinates. Circumstances force me to be very sceptical of this ignorance.

In the lower grades of the service there was extremely little difficulty in distinguishing the Conservative from the Liberal. The employees frequently at their lunch-hour discussed politics and those who are familiar with the dogmatic vehemence and loud speech with which old soldiers discuss anything will see that there would be no difficulty in separating the sheep from the goats.

Apparently also there were comrades present who reported the discussions. Messrs. Nash and Mundy were Conservatives and significantly told the Grits that they were barking up the wrong tree.

This pair—Nash and Mundy—are inelegantly referred to by one witness as "stool pigeons." I believe that they undoubtedly acted as observers or intelligence officers for Mr. J. D. Anderson and that through them the Liberals became marked men. Mr. Anderson himself admits setting Nash to watch Kershaw, whom he finally worried out of the service.

Before proceeding with the individual cases of the accused I wish to mention a singular matter that arose in one of the periodical reductions of staff in D Unit pursuant to orders from Ottawa. On this occasion it became a matter of notoriety that seven members of the Amputation Association commonly known as the Amps had been let out in one day. This was made much of by critics of the administration as proving that the Mackenzie King Government was actuated by what I may term "intensive disregard of front line war service"; and the saving of these men's wages was certainly a most unpopular economy.

This "Seven Amps in a Day" episode was carefully considered by the executive of the Amps, a body that has never allowed the introduction into its proceedings of any party politics. The executive figured out that it was a move to try and stir up feeling against the Government; a Tory move to discredit a Grit Government.

I shall now take up the cases of the eleven officials whom I felt should be called upon to show cause. I deal with them in the order in which I notified them to appear.

Lt.-Col. Morrison

Lt.-Col. G. F. Morrison, Unit Director of Administration at Toronto, had an excellent training in business before the war and has a distinguished record of front-line service.

Both he and his counsel, Mr. H. J. Sims, K.C., appeared astonished at the quantity of evidence throwing suspicion on the Colonel.

Part of this massing of testimony is undoubtedly due to the fog of administration to which I have referred. For instance, taking the case of the retirement

of a very useful investigator and employment scout, Mr. James Armstrong, he and Major Megaffin appear to blame Colonel Morrison and Colonel Morrison appears to blame Major Megaffin. Armstrong's file shows that his retirement was an administrative act of the Medical Branch and that these two officers, the Colonel and the Major, were blindly hitting each other in the fog about something neither had in his control.

But I feel that a considerable part of the disaffection towards the Colonel has been due to his rather indirect methods. Dealing with soldiers (and ex-soldiers) it is no doubt a duty to be upright. But it is still more important to be downright. Talents that would be appreciated in a diplomatic corps get one into trouble with soldiers. An instance of the Colonel's indirect methods is his very regrettable propaganda against Mr. Harry Young when Young first came to act as the Colonel's deputy.

The Colonel himself in his evidence and his counsel in his very able analytical argument have demonstrated that the greater number of acts complained of as caused by partisanship are capable of such other explanation that the suspicion falls far short of a certainty.

On the other hand I cannot quite accept the Colonel's somewhat exaggerated representation of an almost virginal ignorance or innocence of politics. He admits so many exceptions that the exceptions seem to eat up the rule.

There are several cases where the explanations offered seem to me by no means satisfactory.

In the case of Mr. Leslie Flemming (a Liberal) who was passed over for promotion in favour of Mr. J. D. Anderson (a Conservative) the Colonel with his usual indirectness of method gave one explanation at the time to Mr. Flemming and has given another and rather confused one in his evidence. I am not blaming the Colonel for this act of passing over Flemming. He would have been a bold official to have made the promotion in face of the deputy minister's order, "You will have to get rid of Flemming". But, as usual, indirectness of method has bred lack of confidence.

In the matter of Captain Burness, a case of political discrimination by which Colonel Smart was put over Burness' head in the Relief Section, which I shall take up at greater length elsewhere, Colonel Morrison according to his own evidence seems to have accepted the recommendation of Mr. Anderson and Mr. Harry Young, "who knew Colonel Smart very much better than I did". There is a remarkable vagueness about his recollection of this case—he says "I must have approved of the appointment".

I call this remarkable because at this time, December, 1922, as well as other times Colonel Morrison, according to his own evidence (and as a matter of fact), was giving a good deal of personal (and disinterested) attention to relief work, and it seems remarkable that he should have allowed so capable and practical a relief worker as Captain Burness to be supplanted by an official whose book-keeping duties were on a petty cash level. However, while he knew Burness as a Liberal we have no direct evidence to contradict the Colonel as to his lack of knowledge of Colonel Smart's politics. The record runs:—

"Q. Did you know that he was a Conservative?—A. No, sir.

"Q. Who would know about that?—A. I think Mr. Young and Mr. Anderson might know about that."

Colonel Morrison's explanation as to this transaction is unsatisfactory because it leads us either to the one alternative that he was winking at a partisan act or to the other alternative. This other alternative is to accept the evidence of Major Megaffin—which on account of its heat and bitterness I am slow to accept—"that Morrison is, in my opinion, unfitted for his job, and that despite the fact that he has been there for years he to-day is

thoroughly dependent, wholly dependent on his subordinate staff to execute the duties of the department."

No one knew better than Colonel Morrison what a vital problem relief was in the winter of 1922-3 and how he came to approve such an appointment to the head of the relief section is something he has not satisfactorily explained.

In the episode of the passing over of Mr. Herb. Lewis, well known to all parties as a Liberal, and the recommendation of Messrs. Nash and Mundy (hereinbefore mentioned as Conservatives) to the Minister of Labour for the employment service of Canada, I find Colonel Morrison's explanation still more unsatisfactory. Now Mr. Lewis was at the time the most outstanding and successful employment scout in the D.S.C.R. and all the officials speak in his praise, nevertheless his merits were carefully kept in the background and Nash and Mundy were recommended with Mears (a Liberal) in third place. Nash and Mundy had practically no experience as employment scouts.

As Colonel Morrison says, "They were not employment scouts".

The explanation given by the chain of command, Morrison-Young-Anderson is that the preference was given to Nash and Mundy on account of their severe disabilities.

As Colonel Morrison says, "I did not know the jobs that these men were going to take in the employment office; they simply said, there were going to be three vacancies in the employment office. I did not know what the jobs were, but on account of their being amputation cases, I recommended them. I think Lewis is a real scout; he is a good man for the job."

To me the explanation is incredible. Employment goes to the very root of soldier re-establishment; it is that for which the department was invented; but neither the Colonel, his deputy nor Mr. Anderson opens his lips to ask the natural question, "What sort of work will the men we recommend have to do?"

Normally men of business instinct do not recommend a man for a job without some idea of what are the necessary qualifications.

But in the case of soldiers' employment, Colonel Morrison, Mr. Young and Mr. Anderson must all have known that the difference between a good employment scout and an inexperienced one might be several scores or even hundreds more veterans found jobs in a year. So that retaining two men in service on account of their disabilities might be the means of losing employment for many, many veterans.

The unemployment of veterans has by no means become a solved problem and for several years after the war it constituted a menace to public stability. That the D.S.C.R. officials in Toronto were so supinely negligent of their duty as not to inquire for what the Employment Service of Canada wanted two veterans is to me a confession of such amazing imbecility in administration that I cannot believe it. The alternative is that Nash and Mundy were given a partisan preference over Lewis.

I shall conclude my consideration of Colonel Morrison's case with a reference to the evidence of two witnesses, Jones and Dupuis, and of Colonel Morrison in rebuttal. These were two of the original "Seven in a day" Amps, had both lost the right leg at the hip, had become very well known to Colonel Morrison as Liberals and give very picturesque evidence as to their vicissitudes, including that of Jones' being sent up a ladder to do painting.

Colonel Morrison has produced an affidavit by Jones impugning one of the statements by Dupuis. The circumstances under which the affidavit was obtained are set forth in the evidence of Colonel Morrison:—

"Q. Jones is a man who has given evidence in this inquiry as well?—A. Yes, sir.

"Q. What did he come to you for the other day?—A. He came to me, sir, to get the benefits of cheap transportation to England for himself and his wife.

"Q. What did you tell him?—A. I told him that I had not used that regulation for some time and I did not know if it was still in the regulations, but I would look it up for him."

This commissioner does not like evidence where the left hand negotiates about an advantage to the deponent and the right hand reaches for an affidavit.

The culminating episode in the Jones and Dupuis vicissitudes is described by Jones as follows:—

"Then I went again to Colonel Morrison and told him what happened." (Jones had failed to get a job with the Rehabilitation Committee.) "He said I am going to help you boys out. I am going to ask you to take a letter down to Mr. George Shields, M.P.P., and ask him to use his influence to give you a job on the Liquor Commission." I took the letter down and the first thing that happened after Mr. Shields opened the letter was he wanted to know if we belonged to the Conservative Association. He told us that these jobs were for the members of the Conservative Association only and asked us if we would like to join the Conservative Association. We took the letter back to Colonel Morrison and we told him that job was a washout. I said all we got was an application to join the Conservative Association. We would not join that for anyone. He said, "You fellows must forget politics. That is the only thing to do. Consider this. You may get a job out of it. If you do what Mr. Shields told you and join you may get a job." I told him I would not give them the fifty cents membership fee.

Before proceeding with the episode I may say that I see no ground for criticizing Colonel Morrison for giving a letter of introduction to Mr. Shields or anybody else; it is what happened after Jones and Dupuis came back from Mr. Shields.

The evidence of Dupuis is to the same effect as Jones and rather more ample, and mentions that Mr. Shields gave them a letter to Mr. Labatt asking him apparently to give them cards to fill out for the association.

But as the learned counsel for Colonel Morrison warns me that "Dupuis' evidence is unreliable", I shall content myself with the Colonel's own evidence as follows:—

"Q. Apparently Jones and Dupuis came back and told you that Mr. Shields wanted them to join the Conservative Association, did they?—A. They came back and told me they did interview Mr. Shields and he asked them whether they were Conservatives or not and they had said no, they were not, and he said, 'well you will have to get a card' and he put on a note; I remember the letter that Jones brought back. There was a note there to a Mr. Lamont or some such name as that, referring them to some association which I took to be the Conservative Association as he told them they would have to get a card; and Jones said, "I know this man". It was not Lamont.

"The COMMISSIONER: Labatt, would it be?"

"The WITNESS: Labatt, I don't know Mr. Labatt but these boys, I believe Jones brought this back and said, 'Labatt knows me so well, Colonel, that I would not give him the fifty cents.' I told them, 'Then I wish you boys would keep out from politics; go ahead and take a card and get a job through it. You don't have to vote that way.' They said, 'Nothing doing.' They would not give him the fifty cents."

When Colonel Morrison told two declared Liberals to go ahead and take a card in a Conservative Ward Association he was acting as a recruiting sergeant for a Conservative Ward Association. And when he added, "and get a job through it. You don't have to vote that way," he uttered the most cynically atrocious political principle ever enunciated by a Canadian public official.

Mr. Young

Mr. Harry Young, Assistant or Deputy Unit Director of Administration, is an older soldier than most of those employed in the D.S.C.R., being a veteran of the South African as well as of the Great War. His talents are practical and I have no doubt in such matters as the Vetract, with which he is chiefly occupied, he has been a valuable public servant.

I do not set much value, one way or the other, on the evidence of one witness he adduced that Mr. Young has been a Liberal. If so he would come under my definition of a "furtive Liberal."

Throughout the evidence his name has appeared in the chain of responsibility, Morrison-Young-Anderson. But I early noticed that there was very little of direct accusation against Mr. Young and that he had rarely made himself offensive. So much was this evident that I asked one of the witnesses whether in the acts of which he was complaining Young was participating in these acts against Liberals from enthusiasm for the Conservative party or because of his position.

In the army a person in an intermediate position like Mr. Young acquires a great passion for what may be termed the solidarity of the regiment; so that he will religiously back the play of both his immediate superior and his immediate subordinate. This is necessary to discipline.

I think that all that is wrong with Mr. Young is that he has been so long in His Majesty's forces that he instinctively covers Mr. Anderson, his subordinate; and like an old sergeant-major says, "Yes sir", and repeats in a louder tone anything Colonel Morrison may say.

Mr. Young conducted his own case and was very straightforward in his evidence, and if his reasons for his acts did not always satisfy me, nevertheless I cannot find any political motive actuating Mr. Young.

Mr. Anderson

Mr. J. D. Anderson, in charge of the General Division in "D" Unit, Toronto, has a good record of front line service, in which he received a gun-shot wound permanently injuring his right arm.

He was well represented by his counsel, Mr. J. B. Allen.

The evidence shows that he received two promotions in the D.S.C.R. in preference to better qualified men that were available. But no one is to blame for accepting promotion; the responsibility is on those conferring it.

The evidence is quite strong that he nagged Mr. Hutt and Mr. Kershaw out of the service. Both of these men were Liberals and belonged to the group that was kept in observation by Messrs. Nash and Mundy.

I am not sure, however, that his persistent "riding" of these disability cases was altogether political. One of the characters that an officer early comes against in the army is the type of non-commissioned officer who hurts discipline by being over-fussy about minute things and irritating the men under him until they as the saying is "fly off the handle". In the army such a non-com. is called a "Crime-maker" and measures are taken to assuage his zeal.

I think Mr. Anderson was somewhat swollen with his authority and was a crime-maker at the time he so persistently nagged Hutt and Kershaw. That he could do so is a sign of bad departmental organization: his superiors should have better supervised his methods. For it is particularly unfair and unwise to adopt nagging tactics with disabled veterans. These citizens are the relics of very high-spirited men, the flower of Canadian shock-troops. Their disability makes them peculiarly sensitive to and resentful of bullying and nagging.

I do think that in the Burness episode which I have previously mentioned, political discrimination is the real explanation of Mr. Anderson's action in recommending Colonel Smart to be put over Burness.

Mr. Anderson was quite aware that in relief work the man that counts is he who quickly ascertains the deserving case and arranges that relief be distributed at once so that the family will not be without a fire in the stove and food in the cupboard. Captain Burness has this talent of quick work.

The duty Colonel Smart was performing was sorting over the small five and six dollar accounts; about the grade of work done in his leisure time by the financial secretary of a fraternal lodge. So responsible and onerous was this duty that Jones who had been a painter in the Orthopedic Branch was able to take over the duty and easily overtake the arrears of this ponderous accounting.

Captain Burness was by that time known to everybody in the unit as a Liberal and Colonel Smart was equally understood to be a Conservative. In view of the flimsiness of the pretext set up in defence I cannot do otherwise than find Mr. Anderson's action in this case to be a partisan act.

I think similarly of the action of Mr. Anderson in the case of Mr. Herb. Lewis, previously mentioned, and the indefensible preference given Messrs. Nash and Mundy. The alleged failure to inquire for what function these veterans were required by the Employment Service of Canada was so utterly negligent of all sense of duty and so cold-bloodedly disregarding of the interests of the thousands of unemployed veterans that I do not believe the pretext. I find the preference of Nash and Mundy a partisan act.

Dr. Hewitt

One of my difficulties in connection with this investigation so far as pertains to the medical services is a curious mental attitude. When dealing with the Administrative Branch the officials, Deputy Minister Parkinson, Major Flexman, Mr. Stewart, Colonel Morrison, Mr. Young, and Mr. Anderson—with an occasional left-handed side wipe where the defendant is of a punitive temperament—devote themselves to mending their own fences and trying to show an absence of political motives, as well as showing that any administrative acts that have been incidentally impugned were proper administrative acts. This makes it much easier for the commissioner to analyse the matters of complaint and in the case of allegations of political bias ascertain if this motive were really an important or governing factor. It also enables the commissioner to make suggestions that may have value in any reconstruction that may be contemplated.

These headquarters officials, the deputy minister, Major Flexman and Mr. Stewart, all explain a state of conditions that each had to meet and a policy followed by him with which we may or may not agree. This method of treating the investigation while it protracted the sittings and greatly lengthened the evidence was I think the most reasonable method to adopt.

The statements (in lieu of evidence) tendered by Dr. Hewitt and his chief, Dr. Arnold, rather present the spectacle of a vituperative debate directed against Dr. Coultts. Each of these learned physicians whom I have asked for their defence appears to be obsessed with what I may term a Coultts complex. They give very superficial efforts to the rest of the evidence and devote an extraordinary amount of attention to Dr. Coultts. I had not intended to specifically refer to Dr. Coultts' evidence in my report, as like a coroner I regarded it rather as containing "leads" or "clues" to more definite information. He was examined early when the inquiry was rather groping towards the light.

I had of course noticed the statement of Dr. Cascaden that "when the minister, the Hon. Dr. King, was here in February, I think it was, they practically demanded of the minister that Coultts be dismissed that very day". But as Dr. Cascaden thought that "they" were Colonel Morrison and Dr. McMane, and as I could see and can now see no reason why either of them should worry about Dr. Coultts, I thought this matter of attempted dismissal too involved in the fog of conjecture.

After reading Dr. Arnold's statement and Dr. Hewitt's statement, I think there may have been more than suspicion or conjecture: in fact Dr. Arnold admits his desire to retire Dr. Coutts. As probably a new minister has no one under him that certain others in his employ do not try to advise him to dismiss I shall not dwell upon the subject.

But before leaving this Coutts episode it may be noted that Dr. Arnold complains of the excessive Liberalism of Dr. Coutts and says "that his sole measure of judgment seems to have been whether or not the man to be taken on was known as a Liberal". On the other hand, with a vehemence reinforced with red ink, Dr. Hewitt proceeds to denounce Dr. Coutts in these terms: "The present Unit Medical Director, Dr. Hewitt, from his own acquaintance with Dr. Coutts, has never considered him to be nor does he now consider him to be anything but a Conservative."

As things are, the statements of Dr. Hewitt and Dr. Arnold (in which they had the assistance of counsel) afford very little aid to the commission in its work, while emphasizing the virulence of the feud so long existing and so hopelessly never-ending between the B.P.C. and D.S.C.R. doctors.

Dr. S. R. D. Hewitt, the Unit Medical Director at Toronto had front-line service at Salonika. Graduating in 1914 (with honours as a gold medallist) he had an exceptionally good standing as a student but had no general experience as a practitioner other than what he could pick up with his military unit. Considerable evidence has been given as to his practising as a physician and appearing as a specialist on the staff of the Western Hospital. It appears, however, to have been the policy of the department to permit this, owing to the temporary or at least precarious nature of his employment. I have no doubt that with his natural ability he is progressing towards eminence as a specialist. But I cannot find anything either in his general training or experience any more than I can find in that of his departmental chief, Dr. Arnold, that could enable him to make an authoritative decision as to the professional competence of another physician or surgeon. In other words his recommendation to Dr. Arnold would be the suggestion of a sometime brilliant student improved by a specialist post-graduate course in one subject to a comparatively inexperienced practitioner. Both of these professional men have been the pets of office and seem somewhat swollen with authority.

The evidence throughout shows Dr. Hewitt, the Unit Medical Director, as the facile instrument of Dr. Arnold, the Director of Medical Services. They have a complete understanding. Between themselves they are "Bill" and "Sam".

I cannot conceive that Dr. Hewitt after the way Dr. MacBeth had been recommended to his charge should of his own initiative proceed to eliminate him. But he was present when Dr. Arnold insistently inquired after Dr. MacBeth's politics and thereafter Dr. Hewitt proceeded to eliminate Dr. MacBeth. MacBeth of course was a Liberal.

The evidence as to Dr. Gunn is sufficiently clear. Dr. Gunn, a well known Liberal ousted for no tenable or even untenable reason from Newmarket Hospital to make room for Dr. McGhie, is tossed, from pillar to post in the Toronto area. Finally he is dropped down from the Christie Street Hospital into the clinic and knocked down into part-time service, while a well-to-do (and not for any other than party reason deserving) Conservative doctor is kept on full time.

The whole record including the insincere and discreditably duplicated recommendation of Dr. Gunn for service elsewhere, reveals Dr. Gunn—an old veteran who had sacrificed his established connection and gone abroad to the war with his two sons—as the victim of a very mean and persistent form of partisan discrimination.

I have carefully read the concerted attempt of Drs. Arnold and Hewitt to confuse by statistics the fact of the annual sacrifice of a Grit physician at

Toronto, the said statistics supplied by the defence embracing not only Toronto but other places and hospitals in D Unit. I think Mr. MacGregor—with whom on a great many points I am disinclined to agree—has successfully analysed this matter. I feel that there has been a steady and remorseless attrition of the Liberal personnel and that it has been concerted between the Director of Medical Services and the Unit Medical Director.

The treatment of Mr. H. E. Lewis is a sample of the Medical Unit administration as affecting lay employees. Lewis, after being dumped, as heretofore set out, in favour of Nash and Mundy, began to use influence including that of Mr. Alex. MacGregor, Liberal candidate in the riding where Lewis lives; with the result that Messrs. Morrison and Young sent him to Dr. Hewitt.

There was a vacancy caused by the removal elsewhere of a Mr. Rubidge. The duties performed by Mr. Rubidge were the same as those consistently performed by Mr. Lewis since he joined Dr. Hewitt's staff. They consist in investigation work in northern Ontario and require a man of special qualifications and energy. All the witnesses speak enthusiastically of Lewis, who in spite of a 20 per cent disability but on account of previous experience while in the Northwest Mounted Police and his service with the G.W.V.A. as a field man and in the department itself as an investigator and employment scout, is an ideal man for the position.

From the time of coming to Dr. Hewitt until I sent Dr. Hewitt a letter on July 19 requiring Lewis' attendance at the commission, Dr. Hewitt consistently subjected Lewis to annoyance and loss of pay. There is no question that Dr. Hewitt knew that Lewis was a Liberal. The circumstances of Liberal intervention were patent when he was transferred to Dr. Hewitt. Moreover on one occasion Dr. Hewitt had a queer spell and suddenly gave Lewis a quite violent scolding about his alleged political trickery and political planning.

Mr. Lewis has had considerable travelling to do in performance of his duties and like everybody else has had to give tips or as they are called in the service, "gratuities." Dr. Hewitt made Lewis' life miserable by his continuous attempts (unsuccessful because Lewis was well within his rights) to cut these out of the expense accounts—a matter of considerable importance to a traveller who was receiving only \$105 a month plus bonus, or in all \$121.50.

This was not so serious, however, as the miserable juggling of grades by which Mr. Lewis has been underpaid several hundred dollars since he came to Dr. Hewitt's Department.

Lewis has throughout performed the difficult and in the climate of northern Ontario none too comfortable, duties of an investigator or as it is sometimes called pension visitor. He is not and has never been a desk-man. His staff change sheets show that on December 1, 1924, when he was taken on by Dr. Hewitt, his position was stated as "Investigator". But from the first he received \$105 a month (plus bonus) when he should have received \$125 a month (plus bonus), a loss of some \$16 a month.

My letter of July 19, which contained no hint as to why I wanted Lewis brought light to Dr. Hewitt and on July 21 apparently after discussion in camera with Dr. Arnold he discerned that there has been an injustice, and dimly begins to see that Mr. Lewis has been a loser to the extent of \$16 a month and writes accordingly to Dr. Arnold. Dr. Arnold being now in Ottawa pretends not to be convinced and slips it to Mr. R. M. Stewart, and Mr. R. M. Stewart with his customary obedience writes a letter which I find on Lewis' file and which makes us sorry for every veteran in the service.

The necessary implication from Mr. Stewart's letter is that Lewis (or any other man) is not to be paid according to the actual work he is performing or according to anything he has agreed to accept but according to some mysterious intention as to classification existing in the mind of the superior and not con-

veyed to the employee. As a revival of seventeenth century casuistry in the twentieth century Mr. Stewart's efforts has merits, but as a plain straight forward method of dealing with a disabled but hardworking veteran like Lewis it lacks something.

The total result so far is that Mr. Lewis has not yet received justice. I find the whole treatment of Mr. Lewis by Doctors Hewitt and Arnold to be partisan discrimination.

I think that under independent conditions Dr. Hewitt might with his abilities and personality rise to eminence in his profession. But from his graduation he has always been taken care of, and has been since the war a sort of departmental pet.

A brief ray of sunshine shone for him, according to the evidence, when Conservative rule appeared imminent and he said, "Now you fellows, watch me"; and when the Conservative standard sank he said there would come another day.

I think this Unit Medical Director, Dr. Hewitt, is and always has been a political instrument in the hand of Dr. Arnold, the Director of Medical Services.

Dr. McMane

Dr. Charles McMane graduated in medicine in 1905 and has good qualifications in both medicine and surgery. Has a good record of overseas service from April, 1915, to demobilization, April, 1919, including front-line service at Salonika. Has been Superintendent of Christie Street Hospital since 1920.

Dr. McMane was ably assisted in his defence by Mr. R. S. Robertson, K.C. In a good many instances the Doctor took the bit in his teeth and plunged into explanations and volunteered statements which were evidently not suggested or advised by his counsel. But his frankness has not injured him with this commission.

It may be that there is at times a certain brusqueness or even brutality of manner shown against the Doctor. But the patients and attendants are ex-soldiers and used to the language of "our Army in Flanders". Soldiers do not mind a superior's being a bit heavy-handed, so long as they are certain that he is even-handed.

It may also be noted that Dr. McMane makes a good deal of difficulty about receiving sick or damaged veterans in his hospital. But that is a matter where he is not at liberty, as laws and regulations now stand, to indulge to any extent his humane instincts. The present system does not make for the friendly and easy reception of a sick veteran.

I have gone very carefully into any accusations or suggestions of political bias in the actions of Dr. McMane. It is evident that the periodical and persistent lopping off of Liberal doctors was not performed on Dr. McMane's premises.

Moreover he has attempted to rectify the unfair discrimination against Drs. Campbell and Mills.

I have no doubt that in his capacity as a private citizen Dr. McMane is a strong Conservative. But I cannot, in all fairness, see that he has carried his politics into his office of Superintendent of Christie Street Hospital.

Dr. Ballantyne

Dr. William H. Ballantyne, Unit Medical Director of C Unit, Ottawa, appeared with his counsel, Mr. H. D. McCormick. Dr. Ballantyne appears to have all necessary qualifications of medical and surgical training and experience and has a good record of front-line service. Out of all the Ottawa evidence there appeared to be only three witnesses who presented anything requiring defence or explanation from Dr. Ballantyne.

The evidence he gave seemed to me quite frank and free from any evasion and I came to the conclusion that if there was any element of political bias affecting the personnel of this unit it could not fairly be charged to Dr. Ballantyne.

Mr. Parkinson

Mr. N. F. Parkinson, Deputy Minister of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, entered the service of the Government after a quite honourable record of front-line service.

Attempts were made by some witnesses to give the impression that Mr. Parkinson was in some respects a weak official under the thumb of Major Flexman, having only superficial knowledge of the duties of himself and his subordinates and generally that he was a good deal as the saying is, of a rubber stamp.

I think this is entirely unjust. Leaving aside the question of political bias and certain intrinsic defects in the D.S.C.R. system, it appears to me that Mr. Parkinson has been a very industrious public servant.

Indeed, listening to the reams of evidence which during the first days of his testimony he remorselessly poured on my head, he reminded me from point of view of his indefatigable industry and his entire lack of sense of proportion of the best type of Old Country solicitor's clerk.

But any evidence as to superficial attention or lack of grasp-of-detail I entirely disbelieve. Mr. Parkinson has a great talent for detail and there is not a lazy element in his nature.

Where the gravamen of the accusation is that a deputy minister exhibited political bias directed against persons of the same political persuasion as the administration under which the deputy minister is operating, we should not expect to find many inculpating footprints.

There is no doubt that a good deal of the suspicion with which Mr. Parkinson was regarded was not well founded as a matter of politics or nepotism. For instance the preferment of Mr. Jack Parkinson in Toronto irons out not as a question of favoritism to a relative of the deputy minister (which he is not), but rather as a reasonable recognition of good service in the department, introduced by good front-line service.

I feel that in a measure Mr. Parkinson is the victim of the fog of administration for which more than anybody else he has been responsible.

There are, however, two episodes in which, giving the matter the most favourable interpretation, I cannot see how I can divest his actions of political bias.

The first is one which I took occasion to call very specifically to Mr. Parkinson's attention, the episode of Mr. Leslie Flemming.

Mr. Flemming complains that the deputy minister on a visit to D Unit (then at Spadina avenue) sent for Flemming and in the presence of Col. Morrison asked him to declare himself as to whether he was a Liberal or Conservative, and he declared himself a Liberal.

Flemming further complains that in the sequel Col. Morrison was informed by Mr. Parkinson with reference to Flemming, "You have got to get rid of him".

This was the matter on which I specifically questioned Mr. Parkinson at Ottawa and he specifically denied making any such statement. However, both the interview in which Mr. Parkinson asked Flemming his politics and the statement by Mr. Parkinson to Colonel Morrison about getting rid of Flemming are corroborated by the testimony of Colonel Morrison who has certainly no reason for supporting Flemming against his departmental chief, Mr. Parkinson.

Subsequently arose the episode of the appointment of Mr. J. D. Anderson to the place vacated by Major Megaffin, to which post Mr. Flemming with his abilities and qualifications naturally aspired.

Colonel Morrison with his usual indirectness of method gave one explanation to Mr. Flemming why he appointed Anderson of whom he said, "he is not the type of man to be in charge of that branch, he does not even speak good English, let alone write a good letter."

In his evidence Colonel Morrison does not follow the reason given Mr. Flemming but gives the vaguest possible reasons for appointing Anderson.

As matters naturally present themselves through the evidence, Colonel Morrison had retained Flemming rather in defiance of the deputy minister. He uses in his evidence the expression "I certainly have been very much interested in Flemming all the way through even to the chances of getting in wrong with my deputy minister when he made the remark that Flemming had to be got rid of".

It is obvious to me that Colonel Morrison while courageous enough to hold Flemming in the service had not the necessary audacity to promote him in defiance of the deputy minister. I feel that in this case Mr. Parkinson used political discrimination against Mr. Flemming which resulted ultimately in loss of promotion.

The other instance of political bias is mixed up with the Burness episode and runs into something which Mr. MacGregor terms the "Official mutiny".

Leaving out of consideration the placing of Colonel Smart over Burness' head which is dealt with elsewhere, Mr. Burness a well recognized Liberal, was taking the place of an official who had retired, and after some seven months he thought he should be receiving a like remuneration and incautiously applied for it. The sequel is well represented in his evidence.

"I spoke to Mr. Anderson and asked him why I was not receiving the same salary as my predecessor received.

"Q. What was your predecessor's salary?—A. \$140.

"Q. And you were getting \$126?—A. He said, 'I will see about that.' Then after that about a week or two, we were called together and I was handed a notification of a reduction to \$105. As Mr. Anderson handed me the letter notifying me of this decrease he said, 'There is a mistake there and I will see you later'. At this time Dr. Beland arrived in Toronto and I received an appointment to meet the honourable gentleman at the King Edward hotel. He received me very cordially and I put my case before him and he said, 'Well Mr. Burness you know we have to cut down expenses. If I arrange for your salary to remain at \$126 will you be satisfied. I said yes I would.'"

This interview left the two participants in a state of mutual understanding—the minister promising and the official expecting the old (but reduced) pay of \$126. The next salary cheque was for \$105. Accordingly Mr. Burness through a friendly lawyer begins to approach the minister. The minister replies, "that I am under the impression that Mr. Burness is receiving the remuneration which he formerly received and also that he is quite satisfied, if I am to judge by the interview I had with him some time ago in Toronto."

The details of the matter are collected by Mr. MacGregor in what he terms the "Official mutiny." The then minister was one of the most kindly and sympathetic of the public men of Canada. But he had the defect—as we now see it—of giving the most implicit confidence to his departmental subordinates. As sometimes happens in cases of this kind instead of rewarding him by loyalty and generous appreciation they treated his dearest wishes as over-night whims to be evaded next day and subjected him to the humiliation of believing certain things done that his officials had taken care should not be done.

In this instance the deputy minister must take the full responsibility of frustrating the expressed wishes of the minister and I cannot but find that he showed against a well known Liberal, Mr. Burness, political discrimination complicated by contempt for the authority of his departmental chief.

Out of all the huge accumulation of relevant, irrelevant and documentary evidence I am sorry to have to make these findings reflecting on the career of Mr. Parkinson. I shall ask those who may feel called on to weigh my findings to also consider that under unrepeatable conditions that had no guiding prece-

dents, were changing from month to month, and have been up to this day perplexing, this deputy minister has carried on with what to me is amazing industry and dexterity.

Major Flexman

Major Ernest Flexman, Director of Administration, has a quite honourable record of front-line service.

Upon him fell the chief burden of the rather unpleasant task of reducing the swollen administrative staffs of the D.S.C.R. In performing this service he went everywhere in Canada and interviewed each individual employed, going over that individual's actual work in order to familiarize himself with what each was doing. As the result of this enormous labour he found as he says, a tremendous amount of duplication. It was manifestly a case where somebody had to use the axe and this unpleasant task fell mainly on Major Flexman.

His evidence was very full and specific and, in pleasing contrast to some others, he showed no inclination to say anything disagreeable about anyone else.

In reductions of a staff from about ten thousand to less than two thousand undoubtedly cases will be found where probably not the best men were retained and where a natural sense of injustice will be left rankling. But I have been unable to discover any political motive or bias in Major Flexman's administrative acts.

He has been accused of having a "Flexman chain" and in one sense I think the accusation not ill-founded. But it was in no sense a political chain, but rather a system of preference founded on actual front-line service. As commissioner I do not feel called upon to assert that in a department manned by soldiers and for the benefit of soldiers, a prejudice in favour of front-line service is very unforgivable.

On the whole I think Major Flexman has deserved well of the country.

Dr. Arnold

Dr. W. C. Arnold, Director of Medical Services, practised medicine for some ten years in Dubuc, Sask. Went overseas as far as England on a contract for one year with the R.A.M.C. Before the expiry of the year was returned to Canada, it is said on compassionate grounds. Had no front-line service and apparently sought none.

Struck off the strength of the overseas forces, he took up duties with the C.A.M.C. at Regina. While in uniform he unsuccessfully contested the riding of Pheasant Hills in the provincial election of 1917 as a Conservative candidate. He continued in the C.A.M.C. until the end of the war.

From Sir Jas. Loughheed he received his first appointment in the D.S.C.R., Unit Medical Director at Regina. Not long after he was transferred to Ottawa as Assistant Director of Medical Service under Dr. E. G. Davis.

The evidence taken in London and Dr. Arnold's reply thereto leave us in doubt as to the precise nature of the manoeuvre by which Dr. Davis was shifted to the Pension Board and Dr. Arnold promoted to the post of Director of Medical Services. At any rate the shuffle was made and it is fairly obvious that his rapid rise was not due to the professional eminence of the country doctor from Dubuc but to the political interest taken in him by Sir James Loughheed.

That Dr. Arnold exercised his office of Director of Medical Services without ingratitude to the Conservative interest will be manifest from a reference to the file of his subordinate, the Unit Medical Director at Winnipeg. In 1921 during the Dominion elections this Unit Medical Director, Dr. McIvor, retired to contest a seat in Winnipeg for the Conservative party. He was defeated and was reinstated in his position of Unit Medical Director by Dr. Arnold before the

Hon. Mackenzie King took over the Government. The investigation of the Winnipeg office and the appropriateness of retaining this Unit Medical Director are outside the scope of this commission.

I cannot find that the accession of the Liberals to power has caused Dr. Arnold to relax in the slightest his political activities. The "Arnold Chain" is no fiction. For Dr. Arnold appears to have carefully built up a political and personal chain composed primarily of himself and his unit medical directors. They personally address him as Bill and speak of him in terms of affection as Bill Arnold; and their obedience is blind. "Ask Bill Arnold," says the Unit Medical Director at London—"Ask Bill Arnold if there is anything he wants done."

The administration of the Medical Unit in London under Dr. Arnold excites a feeling not quite akin to admiration. Unless it shows political competency then from every point of view it shows amazing incompetency in the Director of Medical Services.

He found in office Dr. Alexander, Unit Medical Director, and Dr. McGhie, Superintendent of Westminster Hospital. They at least had this in common with Dr. Arnold—they had no front-line service. Indeed they had not been overseas. At any rate they could agree with Dr. Arnold in a disregard of front-line service as a necessary or useful qualification.

Dr. McGhie is by this time no doubt a quite competent and learned psychiatrist capable of filling any post in a mental hospital.

When Dr. Arnold took over his duties Dr. McGhie was a raw young doctor with no basis of knowledge as a general practitioner and no special training in mental hospital work, who had been pitch-forked first into the command of Newmarket Hospital and then into command at Westminster Hospital. Some years later he took a post-graduate course at Boston and quite recently a six months' course in Toronto. Dr. Arnold justifies himself in a policy of "laissez faire" by pointing to what Dr. McGhie now is as a psychiatrist. But we must judge Dr. Arnold's action or lack of action as of the time when Dr. Arnold became Director of Medical Services. At that date Dr. McGhie was simply a young empiric playing with a five hundred bed hospital. It was Dr. Arnold's manifest duty to put at the head of Westminster Hospital a really experienced psychiatrist until at any rate Dr. McGhie had qualified. I am not like Dr. Arnold, losing myself in admiration of Dr. McGhie's present eminence. I am thinking of the occupants of those five hundred beds during the long period of Dr. McGhie's green and experimental years.

Dr. Arnold tries to take the whole responsibility for the action and lack of action of Dr. Alexander. He well might. No conscientious administrator would have so long kept that elegant sinecurist in his empty job. Dr. Alexander has been simply there to do what "Bill Arnold wants done."

The situation in London lent itself to the despotism of Dr. Arnold. The positions of both Dr. McGhie and Dr. Alexander very much depended on the whim of Dr. Arnold. If he had denoted Dr. McGhie at any time during his earlier years or released Dr. Alexander at any time as superfluous it would have passed as a proper administrative act on Dr. Arnold's part and could not have been criticized. Accordingly these tame members of the Arnold chain could be relied on for docility and tractability.

The evidence with regard to London shows a gradual reduction of staff and that the Liberals suffered more attrition in proportion to their numbers than the Conservatives. Drs. Arnold, Alexander and McGhie may divide the credit of this between them. It appears to have been recognised by most of the witnesses as systematic.

Dr. Arnold in acting as rear guard for Dr. Alexander takes responsibility for the release of Dr. Preston, the X-ray specialist. His reasons are illuminating and make one wonder at the calibre of the man who has so long held this office of Director of Medical Services. He says, "I found that with X-ray

facilities at hand at Westminster Hospital a great deal of what I considered was unnecessary X-ray work, particularly of heads, was being carried on as a matter of interest and research." Accordingly a comparatively inexperienced doctor puts the hoof on research in a great psychiatric hospital.

The consideration meted out to Drs. Towers and Campbell is a fair sample of the equity of the Arnold system of administration. Both these doctors had a very long period of front-line service and both are Liberals. Some attempt was made by the defence to play upon the name and initials of Dr. Campbell—John A. M.—and pretend that it stood for John Alexander Macdonald. As however the A stands for Archibald, the Conservative "motif" is lacking from the lineage as it is from the voting proclivities of Dr. Campbell. Dr. Arnold had no front-line service, Dr. McGhie was never overseas. Dr. Horne his next in command was never overseas and Doctors Nicol and McLean do not seem to have had front-line service. All these are rated Conservatives.

About two years ago it was intimated that the choice lay between these two Liberal doctors, Towers and Campbell, as to who should be released. This year the blow fell upon Dr. Campbell to the annoyance and disgust of both London Conservatives and Liberals alike.

Dr. Arnold attempts to palliate the removal of Campbell by the following statement:—

"The actual reduction in staff was delayed for some months and until I had been definitely informed that the Ontario Service was willing to take Dr. Campbell on their strength and to allow him credit for the time he had spent in the service of the Department. Dr. Campbell's file shows this quite clearly also that he was aware of the effort that had been made in his behalf and refused to consider a position in the Ontario Hospital Service."

Dr. Campbell has tendered an affidavit to the effect that no such offer from the Ontario service was made. Moreover I have requisitioned the file of Dr. Campbell from London and it is quite silent and empty on this matter.

Not being myself involved in the feud between the B.P.C. doctors and the D.S.C.R. doctors I do not for a moment suggest that Dr. Arnold has meant to deceive but I feel that he is confusing this with some other case.

Concerning this Campbell case Dr. Arnold further states:—

"Dr. Campbell states that his senior army service was not taken into consideration. Since I did the considering I am the only one in a position to state positively whether it was or was not and I say that it was—the other factors unfortunately were not equal."

Now the value to a physician and especially a psychiatrist of his overseas service is well stated in the evidence of Dr. Towers. He was asked what bearing his overseas service had on his ability to attain an understanding of his patients. He answered: "Because I can actually understand a great many if not all of the experiences that most of those men went through. I feel that way about treating any man that has seen the service."

This experience of actual front-line service cannot be imitated or substituted for by lectures or post-graduate courses, and when Dr. Arnold pretends to have given it due consideration, I submit that it is a factor that cannot be honestly weighed by one who surveyed the hurly-burly by looking across the channel from Westliffe Hospital whither he had retired when the R.A.M.C. unit to which he was attached gathered its men for service in France.

I find that the removal of Dr. Campbell by Dr. Arnold was an act of political discrimination complicated by intensive disregard of front-line service.

The cordial relations between the personnel of the Pension Board Branch and Dr. Arnold are admirably illustrated by the evidence of Dr. Gordon and Mr. D. E. Campbell. Dr. Arnold fully reciprocates by accusing Dr. Gordon of disloyalty and of making falsehoods under oath. Mr. Campbell he diagnoses

as suffering from delusions, of persecution causing him to give evidence of "an almost paranoid trend."

A common person not in the B.P.C. Branch such as a hospital attendant Dr. Arno' dismisses as a "mischievous liar."

Coming to D Unit at Toronto we find the same tendency in Dr. Arnold to term any hostile witness a liar and the same tendency to reciprocate the bitterness of the feud between the B.P.C. and the D.S.C.R. His discussion of Dr. Coutts degenerates into scolding.

With reference to Dr. W. B. MacBeth, Dr. Arnold does not deny the evidence that he forced MacBeth to declare his Liberal politics, but asserts that MacBeth expressed himself as perfectly satisfied with arrangements. Dr. MacBeth has recently written a letter from California in which the circumstances of his dismissal still rankle very bitterly. I should have paid little attention to such a letter at this date had not MacBeth complained at the time the action was taken.

But MacBeth had appealed to Mr. Ross, a very active Liberal (and now President of the Toronto Men's Liberal Association), complaining of his treatment and describing the process of attrition. He complained to Mr Ross: "It is always a Liberal that goes; if they want to cut down this way or that way it is always, strange to say, that the stroke would fall on the Liberal."

MacBeth had also complained to Major Megaffin, who took the trouble to write to the Prime Minister, who no doubt followed his usual practice and handed the matter over to Dr. Beland, who no doubt followed his usual practice and handed the matter over to Dr. Arnold, who seemingly always in such cases where Cabinet ministers intervened decided the matter contrary to the Liberal interest. This we shall find is an Arnold characteristic.

The process of attrition by dropping Liberal doctors from Christie street year by year is denied by Dr. Arnold who attempts to confuse the issue by statistics concerted with Dr. Hewitt involving other places in D Unit than Toronto. The analysis by Mr. MacGregor of these statistics shows that Dr. Arnold's defence is superficial and untenable. The fact remains that the process of remorseless attrition of Liberal doctors went on year by year and Dr. Arnold was fully cognizant of and responsible for same.

The case of Dr. Gunn, a quite well known Liberal, is a particularly distressing one. Dr. Gunn went overseas with his two sons and while there contracted a serious heart disability. He had given up a good steady practice to go overseas.

After his return he was for some time in charge of the Hospital at Newmarket but was suddenly removed to make way for Dr. McGhie, afterwards Superintendent at Westminster, London. This was in 1919 before Dr. Arnold became Director of Medical Services.

Dr. Gunn carried on as medical officer with the clinic of the D.S.C.R. from September, 1919, and also as visiting physician, his salary \$275 a month. In 1924 he was sent to the Hospital itself under Mr. McMane. After about a year in the Hospital he was sent for by Dr. McMane and told that Drs. McMane and Hewitt had discussed the matter and they thought he had better come back to the medical clinic again and let Dr. Rogers go up. He was incautious enough to consent and the following May, Dr. Hewitt informed him it would be necessary for him to go on half-time. He was senior in practice to the other physicians in the Clinic, including Dr. Hewitt, Dr. Carson and himself being the only two medical officers there who had been in active medical practice outside of the army or outside of the D.S.C.R. The change from full-time to part-time at Dr. Gunn's age and with his disability was disastrous to him.

I said he was incautious enough to consent. An attempt was made to get Dr. Mills to go down to the Clinic and let Dr. Gilchrist take his place in the Hospital to enable Dr. Gilchrist—who was going to be let out—get a brush

up in surgery before his retirement. Dr. Mills being rather alert resisted this attempt.

He says, "the condition of affairs was pretty evident to everyone, that it was a pure political move to get rid of me."

Not consenting he is still in the Hospital and Dr. Gilchrist has not yet been retired.

Dr. Gunn was trusting enough to go down to the Clinic. The Clinic has been the abattoir for Liberal doctors. Dr. Gunn got the axe. Dr. Gunn's sacrifice to go abroad and his subsequent commitments to re-establish his sons who also went overseas have exhausted his resources and his vicissitudes have exhausted his physical energy. In his stead as a full-time doctor was left Dr. Ecclestone, a Conservative; noted by a non-partisan witness Mr. Dobbs as very dilatory; without disability; well to do and able to do without the position in the D.S.C.R.

I find that Dr. Gunn was politically discriminated against and that Dr. Arnold and Dr. Hewitt were responsible.

There is a remarkable instance of Dr. Arnold's methods in the case of Dr. D. M. Campbell. Dr. Campbell is a Liberal and finding he was slated for removal he appealed to Hon. Chas. Murphy for help, who went to the minister, Hon. Dr. Beland. Of course the interest of two Liberal Cabinet ministers could have no effect on Dr. Arnold. The Laws of the Medes and the Persians!

But Dr. Pencecost, a Conservative, intervenes and Dr. Campbell is retained.

This is part of the superb arrogance of the man. Cabinet ministers are nothing to him; the dismissal of Dr. Campbell is imperative.

His explanation is that Dr. Pencecost convinced him on a basis of efficiency that Dr. Campbell should be retained. What sort of Director of Medical Services have we had that makes dismissals before he ascertains the facts?

This is either amazing lack of competence as a high responsible official or as I think gorgeous political audacity.

Dr. Campbell is retained (also Dr. Mills, another Liberal), but the penalty of Liberalism continues through the long years of service. These Liberal doctors remain (in sufferance) but are paid \$25 a month less than Conservative doctors.

This does not seem fair to Dr. McMane, the Superintendent of the Hospital, or even to Dr. Hewitt, the Unit Medical Director. Dr. Arnold takes to himself the whole burden of the discrimination. He decides to treat Dr. Campbell as an "interne" and short-change him in his remuneration accordingly. This attitude does not impose on Dr. McMane, a man of much wider medical experience than Dr. Arnold, and Dr. McMane decidedly dissents from it.

But assuming that there is the slightest honesty in Dr. Arnold's contention; there are a number of other physicians in exactly the same boat as Dr. Campbell. It is true that there is a titular superior in the Hospital to Dr. Campbell in his capacity as a surgeon. But certain Conservatives are in precisely a similar position, having titular superiors and they have been receiving \$25 a month more remuneration than the Liberal doctors, Doctors Campbell and Mills. Out of his own evidence, and giving any consideration that can be given to his medical theory which manifestly Dr. McMane treats with contempt, Dr. Arnold is convicted of political discrimination against Dr. Campbell, at least whom he well knew to be a Liberal.

Dr. Arnold varies the form of his vituperation in the case of one of the Toronto witnesses whom he vehemently accuses of intoxication. I should have thought Dr. Arnold would leave the liquor question alone in view of the evidence of the deputy minister which places squarely on Dr. Arnold's shoulders the responsibility for the rather wholesale and rather illegal purchase of wine by Head Office Officials in the name of the D.S.C.R. and ordered on the authority of Dr. Arnold.

Outside of his political preferences we can find no positive principle on which Dr. Arnold determines who shall be promoted or retained in the service. But the evidence of his Toronto co-adjutors eliminates two principles that might actuate an honest director of services in a soldier department.

Mr. George D. Allen, Clerk in the Chest Clinic and Past President of the Toronto Branch of the Tubercular Veterans' Association, is not a Liberal. His politics are Labour. Without going into the persistent ill-treatment in the way of pay he was subjected to, it is sufficient to state that after the issue of his commission and while waiting to give his evidence he was called in by Dr. Hewitt and introduced to Dr. Arnold, who on hearing his story said, "You have not had quite a square deal." In a subsequent talk with Dr. Hewitt the Doctor admitted, "Yes, you have had a rotten deal throughout," but could give no reason. Being Labour in his politics Dr. Hewitt calls him a Bolshevik.

But the point I wish to note in Allen's evidence is what Dr. Hewitt said in one interview with him. Allen asked him "if abilities counted in this department." And he snapped his fingers and he said, "You know abilities don't count here."

We may add to this the evidence of Dr. Courtice who when he cited his long army service was told by Dr. McMane, "That don't matter a damn to the D.S.C.R."

Thus adding together the unguarded revelations of a Union Medical Director and of a Superintendent of Hospital we may say that under the regime of Dr. Arnold "Abilities don't count and front-line war service don't matter a damn to the D.S.C.R."

I have noted the capacity of Dr. Arnold for abuse and the freedom with which he bandies the word "liar".

There is one instance where he luxuriates in this epithet where I feel that he has been made the victim of stenographic error.

One of the weaknesses of stenographers, going at full speed, is that they have not the advantage of us who have had a military training, viz., that when we write down a proper name we pause and put it in block capitals. Tactical disasters in the past have taught us this precaution. In the evidence taken before this commission I have found several instances where the situation has been embarrassed by this weakness of stenography.

To the evidence of Rome the switchboard operator, whom Dr. Arnold with his usual facility terms a liar, I paid particular attention. This is what may be termed "Keyhole evidence"—evidence that the person hearing it would not himself obtain or normally try to secure; but evidence that may or may not be truthful. Accordingly I gave more than usual scrutiny to Rome's evidence so that I might give it its proper value.

The stenographic report erroneously introduces the name of Dr. Carson when the witness in each case said Pearson. Dr. Arnold has seized on this stenographic blunder to adduce elaborate evidence that Dr. Carson was never considered for a certain position and therefore Rome is a "liar". But my recollection is that Rome never mentioned Dr. Carson in his evidence. The telephone interview as actually sworn to would then read Dr. Hewitt says, "Hello Bill."

Q. Is that Dr. Hewitt?—A. Yes he always calls him "Bill". I mean Hewitt always calls Arnold "Bill"; and "Sam". They said "What about that job in the Public Health Department? Why? Dr. Gunn is after that; I hear he is after it pretty strong."

Q. Arnold said this?—A. No, Hewitt.

The answer was "Oh that's all right. Pearson has got that job now; we fixed that."

This interview jerky and badly reported as it is, is a commentary on the evidence of Dr. Gunn, who claims that Dr. Hewitt acted with duplicity towards him in relation to this appointment. Dr. Arnold makes an explanation that he was acting in the interest of both Gunn and Pearson. I leave it at that, but the evidence of Rome stands unimpaired.

I gave particular attention to this man Rome because it is necessary to check such evidence very carefully. I gather from the evidence of another switchboard operator, Mr. King, that all the operators do a certain amount of listening in—"because sometimes connections are not very good"; doing it merely from the standpoint of trying to make conversation more clear.

Studying Rome as I did I could not see that he had any malicious inclination or that he had a vivid imagination or command of picturesque language that would enable him to construct a dialogue between officials.

It came as a surprise to myself and equally so to Mr. MacGregor the telephone conversation with which Rome finishes his evidence.

He states:—

"After the election when the West had not been heard from and the Conservatives were ahead at that time, on that morning Dr. Hewitt called Dr. Arnold and he says, "Hello Sam." "Hello Bill". He said, "Happy Birthday, Merry Christmas." He says, "How does she look?" He says, "Oh, everything is fine". Hewitt says, "What about the soldiers' vote? There is an awful row here about soldiers losing their vote, being disfranchised."

Q. Who said this?—A. Hewitt. Arnold says, "Oh to Hell with them; we are sitting pretty".

I think this correctly represents the attitude of Dr. Arnold since he joined the D.S.C.R.—sitting pretty as a partisan cuckoo in the departmental nest and to Hell with the veterans.

Mr. Stewart

Mr. Robert M. Stewart, Assistant Secretary at Headquarters, has a quite honourable record of front-line service. He was represented by counsel, Mr. R. D. Wilson, who assisted him to cover the ground very completely and they went very fully into any matters in evidence that appeared in any way to reflect upon Mr. Stewart in respect of partisanship or otherwise or which seemed to require illumination. Mr. Stewart has largely specialized in what has been known as "Classification" and has a much better and more intimate knowledge of the system of classification followed by the Civil Service Commission than any other official of the D.S.C.R.

When the D.C.S.R. neck passed under the yoke of Civil Service Classification a large number of D.S.C.R. officials were receiving pay on a much more liberal scale than is allowed for fairly similar services under the Civil Service Classification. This resulted in quite a painful number of changes—demotions rather than promotions.

It fell to Mr. Stewart's lot to take up in each unit—he worked at it eleven days in Toronto—the duties of each individual and his nearest approximate classification.

We must therefore in estimating the attitude of witnesses towards Mr. Stewart take into our consideration the fact that in probably the greater number of instances he was the bearer of evil tidings.

Throughout his evidence Mr. Stewart uses plentifully a formula to the effect that any particular act of his was a proper administrative act and that there was no evidence of political partisanship under section 32 of the Civil Service Act or any other statute or authority.

I have considered the evidence carefully and agree with Mr. Stewart as to the latter part of the proposition. I have no doubt that in his private and unofficial capacity Mr. Stewart is a strong Conservative. But I cannot find that partisanship has been a governing or even important element in his official action. He appears to have taken off his politics with his hat when he entered his office.

As to his acts being proper administrative acts I suspend judgment. I am not sure that he has the necessary detachment and impartiality required for ideal classification work. In fact I think he has perhaps over-emphasized a principle of loyalty that is absolutely essential in a military organization and is always to be respected in any organization. As he puts it, "A deputy minister and his assistants must of necessity present to the subordinates in their organization the appearance of indivisible unity". Accordingly in any administrative acts with which I am inclined to disagree I am unable to determine whether Mr. Stewart was obstinately pursuing his own ideas or simply backing the play of his seniors. But in any case I cannot find him guilty of political partisanship.

Dr. Alexander

Dr. Alexander, Unit Medical Director at London, has no record of overseas service or of endeavour to go overseas.

He did not appear personally before the commission but was ably represented by his counsel, Mr. W. B. Henderson.

Much of the evidence touching Dr. Alexander lacks the definiteness of a charge of partisan activity. Indeed the general tendency of the witnesses is to deny Dr. Alexander any form of activity within the department.

It would seem that he spends about eighteen hours a week in office attendance and it is stated that about three of these hours are actually required for his official duties. He appears to be a cultured gentleman of refined and artistic taste with a special knowledge of antique furniture.

As far as possible Dr. Arnold has acted as rear guard for Dr. Alexander and claimed as his own acts any things which the evidence would tend to bring home to Dr. Alexander as partisan in their nature.

This comradeship is beautifully reciprocated by Dr. Alexander when he sends the message, "Ask Bill Arnold if there is anything he wants done".

It would be inconsistent with the evidence of the complainants themselves to find Dr. Alexander guilty of initiating on his own or of pursuing with zeal any plan of political persecution. The evidence is against any such expenditure of energy; he lacks both initiative and follow up.

I find him merely an expensive and quite unnecessary official kept where he is as a necessary link in the "Arnold Chain".

Dr. McGhie

Dr. McGhie, late Superintendent of Westminster Hospital, did not appear personally but was ably represented by his counsel, Mr. A. R. Douglas.

As Dr. McGhie has left the service of the Dominion Government for a responsible post in another sphere of professional activity it would be idle to analyze his past record and any findings I could make would be merely academic.

GENERAL SUGGESTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A perusal of my report so far and certainly of the evidence will convince anybody that the attempted marriage of the Pension Service with the Treatment Service has been a very unhappy union and that the incompatibility is so incurable that there should be an immediate separation of the two services.

The attempts at amalgamation were in some measure the result of complaints by veterans of duplicated medical examinations. As the average veteran would express it he was being pawed over by too many doctors and getting nowhere.

The remedy has been worse than the disease; and the badly concealed hostility between two groups of learned doctors has caused the sick and disabled veterans untold distress. I say untold because I could easily have caused it to be told by calling as witnesses the adjustment officers of the Canadian Legion, The Soldiers' Aid Commission and other bodies; but I thought it not in the public interest to have these bodies brought into what primarily is an investigation into the workings of partisan politics. Moreover I could see that sufficient data would appear in the evidence as it was developing to enable me to make constructive suggestions. I know, however, that the evidence of these adjustment officers would make very distressing reading.

PENSIONS

It should be noted that the Pension Commissioners are in a quasi-judicial position requiring on their part the utmost good faith in the discharge of their duties; because on their decision very often depends the whole future of the applicant and his dependents. Owing to the nature of things these commissioners rarely have the advantage of seeing the applicant or of hearing first-hand evidence. They must depend on the reports of others, chiefly medical witnesses.

It is therefore essential that the commissioners should have the utmost personal confidence in these medical witnesses. The commissioner who acts on the report of a doctor in whom he lacks confidence is in rather a worse position morally than the magistrate who goes through the motions of believing (and registering a conviction on) the evidence of a plain-clothes constable whom he would rather see in the dock than the prisoner.

The essential to good faith on the part of a pension commissioner is that he *believes*. The policy of the department *has been to force a belief*; which in the twentieth century is not recognized as good policy either in legislation or religion.

The result, as might have been expected, is an elaborate and expensive system of circumlocution which reflects unpleasantly on the whole administration of soldiers' affairs:—

(a) Some expert in the D.S.C.R. Clinic reports unfavourably against the claim of an applicant for pension. This blocks the pension.

(b) The applicant goes to the Canadian Legion or to the Soldiers' Aid Commission.

(c) A favourable report from another expert not in the D.S.C.R. is filed with the Pension Board.

(d) The Pension Board reconsiders and in the light of this further evidence very likely grants the pension with payment of arrears.

A good deal of this adjustment work as it is called is done by the Soldiers' Aid Commission which pays the fees of the outside experts. Thus we have the constitutional anomaly of a provincial department having (in order to save the interests of the veterans) to interfere in the internal workings of a Dominion department on a matter that should be wholly within the Dominion jurisdiction.

The obvious remedy is to let the Pension Board select the experts whose evidence they will believe, and not try to force their belief in doctors who have not their confidence.

TREATMENT

With respect to treatment, the sick veterans applying at a D.S.C.R. Hospital or Clinic for treatment is in a bad way. The general attitude towards him seems to be one of hostility. The doctors to whom he applies for admission are less interested in his physical torments than in some doctrine as to his eligibility for pension. They are more concerned in looking at his file than at his tongue. His admission has become increasingly difficult in accordance with an exasperating sort of departmental etiquette.

Formerly the Clinic doctors were free to decide eligibility for treatment and get the man into bed irrespective of the Pension Board. But this door of entrance to a sick man was on the recommendation of the officials nailed up on August 20, 1925, by P.C.1300.

What chance has a sick man for obtaining a full and thorough diagnosis of what ails him from a physician who is mooning his way through the rules as to eligibility for pension.

Diagnosis is not easy; and when a doctor makes an error we laymen are apt to make too little allowance. But what chance of making a good diagnosis has a doctor after running the sort of mental obstacle race laid down in the regulations?

Formerly there was a good deal of admission on what were called "Compassionate grounds," but latterly it occurs chiefly after some newspaper agitation. The officials are apparently afraid to admit a non-pensioner and frequently the pensioner is very grudgingly admitted.

There is some evidence that the Superintendent of Christie Street Hospital, when asked what should be done with the case of a mentally obscured veteran who kept wandering into the Hospital, replied "Kick him out."

Irrespective of its origin, this seems to well express the official attitude towards the sick veteran.

Just here I wish to take strong issue with the whole attitude of those who speak of "Compassionate grounds" or think any veteran whether pensioner or non-pensioner is to be kicked about like a pauper patient.

Not the overseas man but the Government of Canada had to plead "*in forma pauperis*." The promise to put the veteran in no worse position than the stay-at-home was a very absolute official pledge of the Government. I personally assisted before a parliamentary committee at Ottawa, in proving that compared with the stay-at-home the average veteran lost at the lowest calculation \$2 a day for every day he was abroad. The acting Premier, Hon. Mr. Calder, did not deny this or specifically repudiate.

He merely pleaded *in forma pauperis* and in effect said to the House of Commons, "It is admitted that the men have had financial losses. But the Government is not in a position to pay and if you wish to change this policy you will have to change the Administration."

In view of the foregoing it is obvious that any veteran who was any length of time overseas has practically paid an enormous cash entrance fee which should carry with it some "sick benefits" and hospitalization.

While in London on this inquiry I called on Mr. Hume Cronyn, ex-M.P., who during the years 1918-1921 served on the parliamentary committees relating to the Pensions and Re-establishment of the Canadian Expeditionary Force and who was the chairman thereof for two sessions. I asked him "to endeavour to re-create the spirit which animated those committees."

He has written a letter from which I quote a sentence:—

"We were warned by the medical men who testified before us that with the passing years many weaknesses in returned soldiers heretofore undisclosed, would appear. Despite that warning, we adopted as our watchwords, "Generosity" and "Justice"; and agreed that in cases of doubt we would prefer to err on the side of generosity."

The country has successfully emerged from the period of stinginess and financial anxiety and can now be trusted to back any Administration that will re-create the spirit of generosity and justice in favour of a sick veteran.

My recommendation is that treatment shall in future be no more troubled and complicated with theories of "Pensionability" than was the treatment that was given in a Casualty Clearing Station in France; and that the minister be given the widest and most unfettered discretion so that his organization may admit, diagnose, hospitalize and if nature and skill suffice cure any person who served in the Canadian Expeditionary Forces.

People do not ordinarily want to get into a hospital bed and stay there unless they think they are sick. So I do not apprehend a great many cases of conscious imposition; and such cases can easily be dealt with.

PAY AND ALLOWANCES

With respect to the curious practise (sanctioned and enforced by the Orders in Council) of paying a sick pensioner (when in hospital) under the name of "pay and allowances" a less sum than he ordinarily is paid on pension, I should suggest that a man lying on his back is for all purposes of the labour market a total disability and far from being cut down should receive 100 per cent pension.

The public does not know of this roundabout practise of deducting hospital expenses from a pension; and the public if consulted would say that a man disabled in the war should be entitled to both pension and (not or) treatment. The present practice is a chartered form of short-changing a sick man.

I should recommend a new and extremely simplified set of regulations not draughted by the official persons who have hitherto "tithed mint" for the vexation of the veteran. No great mistake would be made in passing through an army incinerator the great tomes of existing Orders in Council and regulations especially as to treatment and pay and allowances.

Before leaving the subject of hospitals I may note that there is considerable dissatisfaction among the smaller and less influential personnel—the nurses, attendants and such like. Doctors in these matters are apt to be very mechanical and because something is done in some other hospital it is good doctrine and good medicine for Christie Street or Westminster. No allowance has been made for the fact that most of this personnel has already been subjected to a war strain.

To a layman it seems that with the explosive mentality of the patients at Westminster there is a strain on attendants somewhat like that on sentry-go; and their hours (slightly diminished since this inquiry) seem to me less like a scientifically thoughtout tour of duty than a case of nigger-driving. These little folk should have more consideration.

SUPERANNUATION AND PERMANENCY

With respect to superannuation it has been pointed out that the employees of the department have all the disadvantages and none of the advantages of the Civil Service Classification. There is no doubt from the evidence that there is an irreducible minimum of service that must continue to be performed both in pensions and in treatment and that the tendency will be towards more rather than less.

These services—after reorganization—should therefore be rendered more permanent and carry the right to superannuation. A necessary preliminary would be to thoroughly review the classification of the personnel retained.

The conduct of classification as heretofore handled has been a good deal blown upon in the evidence; and the evidence shows also a strong impression of partisan injustice in the lists prepared for superannuation. The best Mr. Parkinson, the deputy minister, could say for these lists is that they are not final or complete.

It is possible that, if these partial lists had gone through, the future permanent personnel of the services would have become a solid partisan phalanx. Precautions should therefore be taken in the work of reorganization and reclassification and in recommendations for permanency and superannuation so that the element of mystery and the suspicion of unfair discrimination against anybody shall vanish for all time from the services that affect the veterans of Canada.

A. T. HUNTER,
Commissioner.

JANUARY 10, 1928.