

with reference to them the Board of Pension Commissioners in their statement say:

The retroactive provisions of this section will result in increased expenditure, as stated.

With respect to this section, on which we had a discussion this afternoon, these are the retroactive clauses that make effective the payments of pension, that is to say, the ar-rears of \$450,000 and the \$100,000 per year, mounting up by \$100,000 each year.

Hon. Mr. TURRIFF: Do I understand that that estimate is correct, and is the same?

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: The same thing.

Hon. Mr. TURRIFF: This does not add anything?

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: No; these are merely the clauses that make the other clauses effective.

Section 5 was agreed to.

On section 6—jurisdiction of Board of Pension Commissioners:

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: I move to amend by striking out the words "District Review Boards or" in line 24, in accordance with the report of the Committee.

The proposed amendment was agreed to.

Section 6, as amended, was agreed to.

Section 7 was agreed to.

On section 8—appeals and rehearing:

Hon. Mr. TURRIFF: What does the re-pealing section mean?

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: The Board of Pension Commissioners say:

This section repeals the right of personal appeal to the Board of Pension Commissioners. No additional expenditure is incurred thereby.

Section 8 was agreed to.

On section 9—District Review Boards:

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: From here onwards for some distance we have the report of the Committee, which I think may be followed, at least with respect to the striking out of the clause in regard to the District Review Boards and the constitution of the new Board of Appeal which is provided for in the report. I think this was unanimously agreed to by the members of the Committee.

Hon. G. V. WHITE: I would like to inquire as to the difference in cost between the proposals submitted by the Committee and that contained in the clause as it stands now with regard to the reduction of the number of Appeal Boards.

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: Under this clause 9, District Review Boards were constituted

in each of the 9 districts, with 3 members for each Board. The estimated cost of those District Review Boards was \$480,000 per year, approximately. The committee propose to strike out that paragraph, and at the same time eliminate those Boards. Then, in section 10 we take that section which deals with the appointment of a Board of Appeal, and we amend it so as to increase the membership from 3 to 7—our amendment says from 5 to 7 appointed by the Governor in Council. The cost of the Federal Appeal Board, standing at 3 members, with their secretariat, and so on, was estimated to cost \$100,000. We are increasing that Board by 4 members, and consequently the expenditure will be increased proportionately over the estimate of \$100,000. But we have wiped out the \$480,000, and we have that to the good, and the difference between the increased cost of the Federal Appeal Board and the \$480,000 is saved by this proposal.

A vast quantity of evidence was given before the Royal Commission as to the right of personal appeal. Three incidents were stressed in support of these District Boards of Review. The first was the right of personal appeal on the part of ex-service men; secondly, there was facility, that is, the court was to come to the appellant, as it were; thirdly, there was the speed in winding up these cases. The committee feel that we shall meet those conditions by substituting for those District Boards the increased membership of the Federal Appeal Board; that is, the ex-service man shall have the right of personal appearance; the court will, as it were, come to him; and, by reason of the numbers on the Board, the business will be taken care of with all reasonable speed.

We were induced to take this course primarily by the desire to save this sum of money, and thereby make it available for distribution to the ex-service men themselves. I stated this afternoon that 25 per cent of the money under consideration was deflected to costly, and as we thought unnecessary, bureaucratic machinery.

Under the heading of the third essential—that there should be uniformity of decision—it is obvious that 9 Boards sitting separately would scarcely be able to accomplish uniformity, while under our proposed scheme of 7 members travelling about the country, very much as the members of the Railway Commission do, and hearing these appeals, uniformity would be secured through the medium of the secretariat of the Board. We have provided further, as you notice by the amendment, for a quorum of three. We leave that