

restricting its power. Anybody must know, and would have a general idea of what is meant by a meritorious case. You can only define such a case by giving examples. I think it is impossible for a man to prove or to get all the evidence the Pensions Board requires. His companions are scattered, he has forgotten the name of his Commanding Officer, and so on.

Mr. MCGIBBON: The Commanding Officer often is not in existence.

Sir ARTHUR CURRIE: That is correct. You must know something about the man, himself, the character of his service, and the probability of his disability being attributable to war service.

Mr. THORSON: One other question: Have you any suggestions to make as to how the machinery might be linked up more closely to the applicant himself, so that the Board may get the very information which you suggest is so essential?

Sir ARTHUR CURRIE: I think the Board ought to be a larger body. I was struck with the suggestion someone made, that it ought to move from one place to another, thereby giving a man a chance to appear before it. Men are impressed when they are given a chance to present their cases before the Board. They like to appear themselves, or to have others appear on their behalf, and when they are allowed that privilege they feel they are getting a square deal. I see no reason why we should not have sittings of the Pensions Board in Vancouver, Victoria, or other cities across Canada.

Sir EUGÈNE Fiset: Does that apply to the Appeal Board?

Sir ARTHUR CURRIE: I do not see so much necessity to have the Appeal Board moving around the country.

Mr. CLARK: The Appeal Board is a travelling board, at the present time.

Sir ARTHUR CURRIE: Yes, in my opinion it would be better if it were reversed.

Mr. ROSS (*Kingston City*): May I ask if Sir Arthur Currie will be here for a day or two, Mr. Chairman; will he be able to attend another meeting of this Committee? My reason for asking is because his address has covered the ground so marvellously that one would need a day or so to read it, and to digest the points it has outlined. I do not wish Sir Arthur to think that we want to cross-examine him, but there are certain points in his address which we ought to have before us for study before he leaves here. There are one or two points I would like to have him dilate upon to some further extent. For instance, there is the matter of this appeal. He makes the statement that every case should be subject to appeal. How many people know what cases are refused that privilege? Colonel Belton is here, and he will be able to give us that information; I know of two or three reasons for refusal. There is assessment, there is diagnosis and there is dependency; these cases are not appealable, and I think they should be,—especially diagnosis.

The CHAIRMAN: I was going to suggest, with fear and trembling, that when we have so many witnesses to hear we should sit this afternoon and to-morrow morning. We could ask Sir Arthur to come back to-morrow morning, if he will be so kind.

Sir ARTHUR CURRIE: Please do not ask me to do that, gentlemen. I am at your service, but I would prefer to come some other time. I have not been in my office all week; the whole of the time has been devoted to soldiers' organization business.

Mr. THORSON: May I offer the suggestion that we might recall Sir Arthur Currie after we have heard some of the recommendations of the Legion. He could give us the benefit of his suggestions, based on their recommendations.