

claim would be much larger in the second than in the first case. I do not say this basis of comparison is on all fours with the situation respecting a pension for a disabled ex-service man, but there may be some reason for considering the other aspect.

Senator White also raised the question of aggravation of pre-enlistment conditions. I have talked to the Chairman of the Pension Commission about this matter. He says that certainly there have been a good many cases of very serious complaint about men who were given a clean bill of health on enlistment in the forces, but when later they applied for a pension they were told that in the opinion of the commission the disability from which they suffered was attributable to a condition that existed before enlistment. They in turn cite the certificate that was given at the time of their enlistment. I understand that the commission at times has uncovered a good many cases where definite evidence has turned up which proved beyond a shadow of a doubt that a man whose medical certificate showed he was in A-1 condition at the time of enlistment in fact was not.

I was told of one man who made a claim on the basis of having traumatic arthritis of the knees. It was later discovered on his own testimony that some years before he had enlisted in the Second World War he had fallen off a train—he was hobo-ing through the country at the time, as I think the expression was—and he had considerably damaged his knees and was in hospital three months. This did not show up on the certificate. It was found that the condition of which he was complaining at that time really existed before he enlisted.

There are many such cases. Many files have been built up. The commission tries, I am informed, to be completely objective and fair. They do their best. I suppose, too, the development of modern medical science puts facilities at the commission's disposal which make it easier for them to be more definite about their findings, and that will be the case more and more as time goes on.

Regarding section 70 and the benefit of the doubt, I might mention that I was talking to a very distinguished member of this chamber who was responsible for the drafting of this section. I do not want to take his name in vain or to paraphrase him unfairly, but I understand from him—and he will correct me if I am wrong—that he approached the problem first through two of the ablest counsel in Canada, Mr. Isaac Pitblado of Winnipeg, who happily is still with us and at the Bar, and Mr. Aimé Geoffrion of Montreal. What was proposed to them was that the benefit of the doubt that should be available to an accused in a criminal trial should also be

available to a veteran in a case where he was making an application under the Pension Act, and where it was not certain whether or not his case had been established fully.

I suppose, like any judge or jury, the Pension Commission can make mistakes. The present minister seems to feel that the section, in the light of the experience of the board, could be improved. He said this in the other place in October. I promise Senator White that I will bring to the minister's attention the remarks he made on this point last night, supplemented by a very poor rendition of what I am sure a former Minister for Air might have said had he been speaking in my place this afternoon.

Motion agreed to and bill read second time.

THIRD READING

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, when shall this bill be read the third time?

Hon. Mr. Connolly (Ottawa West): With leave of the Senate, I move that this bill be read the third time now.

Hon. Jean-François Pouliot: Honourable senators, I have two questions to ask, and they can be answered when we meet together again. The first one is: Will the C.B.C. instruct its French broadcasters and commentators to pronounce the word "Noël" correctly until next Christmas?

Honourable senators, you may laugh. We have been speaking of reform, but this is merely the correction of one single word. I am wondering if someone will tell the broadcasters to stop making mistakes in pronouncing that word.

I remember one occasion that Mr. St. Laurent, when he was prime minister, complained of the C.B.C., and the socialist policy was to condemn him for interfering with the management of the C.B.C. I merely want the correction of the pronunciation of the French word "Noël". It is well pronounced by all Englishmen who say it, and I want it correctly pronounced by the French commentators.

My second question is about the C.N.R. trains at Rivière du Loup station. I was certainly disappointed that the Government did not answer my inquiry. The trains stop far west of the station, and it is a great inconvenience. We seem to be laughed at by the management of the C.N.R. in that connection, but I think of the women with children who have to walk a long distance in order to catch a train. It makes no sense, and I hope that my honourable leader (Hon. Mr. Connolly, Ottawa West) will rub the ears of his colleagues who are responsible for the estimates of the Canadian National Railways, and