

for these Gloucester county cases, the expenses would not be one-half the expense of bringing an individual 110 miles away to the town of Newcastle. If the tribunal had sat in Gloucester county they would have been sitting within 45 miles of this man's home. There are many of these cases, and I would ask the minister to look into it and see if some means cannot be found for providing for this difficulty.

There is another point. A doctor's certificate is not admitted as evidence under the new system. The doctor must be summoned to appear in person before the tribunal and give his evidence. Under the old system the certificate of a doctor who had looked after the soldier was admitted as evidence, but to-day, I say, the doctor has to appear in person. The advocates, who are supposed to look after the soldier's interests, did not notify the applicants, at least, up to a month ago, that they should produce the doctor in person instead of a doctor's certificate. The result was that the particular case I refer to was turned down for want of evidence. When the case was heard on appeal before the appeal board I appeared myself in person for the individual because he was too poor to have anyone else do it for him, and I knew the case. The minute I examined the evidence before the lower court I knew that the appeal court could do nothing else but throw out the case. I asked them to issue instructions to have the case retried, and they did so. But look at the expense connected with that process! I trust that the minister will look into this matter, and see if he cannot find a remedy.

Mr. MacLAREN: I should like to assure the hon. member for Gloucester and all other hon. members that the facilities which have been put at the disposal of the soldiers during the last year have been uncommonly good. There may be exceptional instances, and I should like to have a full report on the case that has been referred to by my hon. friend, but on the whole the provision is exceedingly generous. Let me mention for the benefit of the hon. member for Gloucester that last year the tribunal met in New Brunswick at Campbellton, Bathurst, Chatham, Newcastle, Moncton, St. John, Woodstock, Fredericton and Edmundston.

Mr. VENIOT: On what date did they sit at Bathurst?

Mr. MacLAREN: I have not the date, but they sat in nine places in New Brunswick since last November.

[Mr. Veniot.]

Mr. VENIOT: Why is it they are making Bathurst applicants go to Newcastle? I myself paid the expenses of those men.

Mr. MacLAREN: If there is one thing that is being done well it is this particular thing. Since last December these tribunals have met in different places in the hon. member's own province. The instructions are for them to meet in every centre where there are a sufficient number of cases to justify it. The men and their witnesses are paid their travelling expenses and for loss of time. If there is anything wrong it is probably because the man himself has mistaken the instructions or has failed to carry them out.

Mr. VENIOT: I have seen the instructions.

Mr. MacLAREN: What is the committee going to do?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: They are going to bed. It is after eleven o'clock.

Mr. VENIOT: I am not criticizing, I am pointing out what I consider a lack—

Mr. MacLAREN: I ask the hon. member to give me particulars and I will have the case investigated.

Mr. VENIOT: I will give him particulars. Only yesterday I gave \$35 to the man whose case I mentioned to pay his expenses in order that he might see a doctor and get a certificate.

Mr. RYCKMAN: Is that bribery and corruption?

Mr. MacLAREN: Will you put the vote, Mr. Chairman?

Progress reported.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned without question put, pursuant to standing order.

### Monday, July 6, 1931.

The house met at three o'clock.

#### QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

#### DONAT VAILLANCOURT—MAIL CONTRACT

Mr. ROBERGE:

1. Was the temporary mail contract of Mr. Donat Vaillancourt, between Black Lake and St. Ferdinand, cancelled?
2. If so, at whose request?
3. For what reason?
4. Was it renewed?
5. Were tenders called, and if not, why?