

In conclusion, therefore, I would like to cite the following relevant facts: The board recognize the fact that he was gassed. The board recognize the fact that he showed signs of respiratory disease in 1930. The board recognize the fact that he died as a result of longstanding respiratory disease. I also know as a fact that he took the liquor store job in Cabri in 1930 because he could not stand any heavier work. It is for these reasons that I most earnestly ask your aid in this case, to see that justice is done to the widow and child of this man, because if a pension claim is refused in this case, I feel it is not in Her Majesty's best interest.

It would appear that the present pension commission is in a rut and has outlived its usefulness. Some thought should be given to the suggestion that in refusing these applications time and again, the commission is insuring itself there will be sufficient applications for rehearing to keep the commission employed for years to come.

It is not unreasonable to assume that 20 years after the last major conflict there are not sufficient new applications being submitted to keep the board as fully occupied as those members of the board were at the cessation of hostilities in the late forties. Perhaps the present board should be disbanded and replaced with fully qualified men who could adjudicate justly with the remaining applications coming up for rehearing.

An appeal board should be separate and distinct from a board normally set up to hear the original application. To my mind there is danger and evidence of collusion under the present system.

If the committee will not endorse the principle of Bill C-7, that an appellant be allowed to appeal to the courts against an unjust decision, may I suggest, in view of the admission of the spokesman for the commission as recorded in evidence that they do not understand the meaning of the legal phraseology of some sections of the present act, that a subcommittee be appointed from the house to redraft those sections and other relevant sections in line with the intent of parliament and in language that can be understood by the present members of the Canadian pension commission. That is all the submission I have to make at the present time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WEICHEL: Mr. McIntosh mentioned that about 18,000 have been refused pension. Is that under the benefit of the doubt?

Mr. McINTOSH: That is under 13 (2). It arises out of or is directly connected with it. If I might explain the section, parliament in its wisdom saw fit to change that from the way it was originally recorded in the act; it used to be "arose out of and directly connected with military service", and it was changed to read "arose out of or directly connected with military service", making it one or the other. They tried to make it as broad as possible. That was the intent of parliament at the time.

If the commission had read *Hansard*, they would have found out the intention of parliament of that day, and how they intended the commission to interpret that section. But to my mind they have not done so.

Mr. WEICHEL: Of these 18,000, some could be veterans who did not reveal any disability at the time of their discharge, in order that they could get out of the service as soon as possible. Then later some of them discovered that the disability was being aggravated, and a lot of them applied for a hearing. At that time, of course, no medical papers were available on their file in regard to such a disability. Many veterans have talked to me and a lot of them were given no benefit of the doubt.

Mr. MACRAE: Is it our intention now to question Mr. McIntosh or to hear other evidence before we launch upon an exhaustive and complete questioning of Mr. McIntosh?