

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: I move that this Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be amended in the following particulars:

The amendment to clause 11 provides for the manner in which the appeal shall be taken, and reads as follows:

(1) Upon the evidence and record upon which the Board of Pension Commissioners gave their decision an appeal shall lie in respect of any refusal of pension by the Board of Pension Commissioners on the grounds that the disability resulting from injury or disease or the aggravation thereof or that the injury or disease or the aggravation thereof resulting in death was not attributable to or was not incurred during military service.

It forms the basis of appeal.

Then, there is an amendment on page 5, line 48:

After "hear" insert "but only upon the evidence and record upon which the Board of Pension Commissioners gave its decision."

There is then a consequential amendment to subsection 5 of clause 11, which provides that in addition to the applicant or appellant a member of the Board of Pension Commissioners shall also be represented. It reads:

Every applicant and the Board of Pension Commissioners for Canada or its representative shall have the right to attend in person, at any and all sittings for the purpose of hearing an appeal held by the Board or by a member thereof, under such conditions as to the payment of an applicant's expenses thereby incurred as may be fixed by regulation of the Governor in Council, and the applicant may if he so desires, but at his own expense, be assisted thereat by counsel or representative other than the official Soldier Adviser appointed under The Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Act."

Hon. Mr. FOWLER: Are those amendments made by the Committee?

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: They are amendments made by the Law Clerk, consequential upon the amendments which have been offered. I move that the Bill be not now read a third time, and that it be amended by inserting the above amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

THIRD READING

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND moved the third reading of the Bill.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the third time, and passed.

POST OFFICE BILL

SECOND READING

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND moved the second reading of Bill 246, an Act to amend the Post Office Act.

He said: Honourable gentlemen, I was asked, I do not remember now by whom, what would be the reduction of revenue on

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND.

account of the change in the postal tariff on newsprint. The answer which I have received from the Department is that it would be about \$200,000.

Hon. Mr. GORDON: May I ask, what is the justification for reducing this cost to newspapers in view of the fact that we are already losing hundreds of thousands of dollars on their carriage?

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: Here is the statement made by the Postmaster General himself:

By an amendment to the Post Office Act in 1920 a new schedule of postal rates was applied to newspapers and periodicals. At that time the rate was one-quarter of a cent per pound. The new schedule raised the rate on an ascending scale until it reached the maximum of $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound, which went into effect January 1, 1922. Strong objection was made to this maximum rate, particularly on the part of publishers of small town dailies and of weekly newspapers circulating in the rural districts, and it was alleged that the increase represented an added expense of at least five hundred per cent to this class of publishers. They asked that the maximum rate be reduced to three-quarters of a cent per pound, or that in any event it be made not more than one cent a pound instead of the $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents established by the amendment of 1920. This request has been repeated at frequent intervals during the past year and a half both by individual representatives of these publishers and by delegations and correspondents, and after observing the operation of the act the Government is of opinion that the maximum postal rate on these publications might fairly be reduced to $1\frac{1}{4}$ cents a pound. It is to give effect to this decision that the present amendment is introduced.

That is to say, the reduction is from $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents to $1\frac{1}{4}$ cents.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: And it will amount to \$200,000. May I ask my honourable friend, has he been able to make an estimate on the other question which I put to him as to the extent, to which the increase of the Sales Tax will bear upon the particular papers that would taken advantage of the reduced rates? I understand that this reduction will not affect all newspapers. I suppose they could take advantage of it, but in the natural order of their business it will be limited to a few.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: All the users will have the benefit of this.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: Yes, but this reduction in the rate, I understand, will chiefly affect the larger weekly newspapers that are distributed to very distant points from metropolitan centres.

Hon. Sir EDWARD KEMP: Papers that sell for 10 cents each.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: I have tried to obtain the information, but the Department was not in a position to give me an estimate.