

Mr. SPEAKMAN: There is another difficulty, as I see it. It is impossible for any man to represent their views, because there would be no basis of representation. All he could do would be to state his definite ideas as to what he thinks. I think the Legion is better qualified to do that.

Mr. ADSHEAD: What is Colonel Biggar for? Why should we get a special counsel for the soldiers to formulate legal phraseology.

The CHAIRMAN: There is a distinction in my mind in the clause asked for by the Legion, and the clause which will finally be accepted by members of this Committee. They need not necessarily be identical when you come to put them in legislative form.

Mr. MCPHERSON: If the Legion representatives who, I understand, are representatives of the organized soldiers, want assistance by way of counsel, it will be furnished them by the government on recommendation of this Committee, when they ask for it.

Mr. HEPBURN: That request should come from the Legion.

Mr. CLARK: I have in mind that the organization should come here with some concrete suggestion. We have in the past failed to get into concrete form on the statute what we desired. We may have had it in some form, but have not accomplished the desired purpose. My idea would be that the Legion should be represented by the best counsel that can be secured and that the whole body of soldiers organized or unorganized, should be represented by that counsel. He should collaborate with the witnesses and prepare the case for presentation before this committee. He would be a co-ordinating influence between these groups in placing the proper evidence before the Committee so that we will be able to definitely understand it.

Sir EUGENE Fiset: Surely Colonel Biggar could assist; he drafts other legislation.

Mr. McLEAN (Melfort): Two years ago there was no difficulty. We had plenty of well-prepared evidence put before us. I do not think anybody should speak of the Legion in respect to not submitting the information but the trouble with which the Committee was faced was drafting their report. I was not on that Committee so I do not pretend to appreciate all the difficulties, but I was on a subcommittee that had to deal with a simple matter on which every member of that subcommittee was agreed. My experience has been that we have had legal experience and time after time the final report was agreed upon as just what we wanted. It was submitted to the House and the legal minds there could not agree what the draft meant. It was sent back to the subcommittee again and it took three or four conferences before the legal gentlemen in the House could agree with what had been done. I am not objecting to having counsel engaged in the preparation of the report and for consultation on legal matters. In that clause to which I have referred—it was very short only a few lines and contained possibly five or six words of value—there has been a great deal of friction in giving effect to it. This has been due to the fact that a good deal of doubt exists as to its interpretation and I would impress upon the Committee as strongly as I can the desirability of drafting the report clearly. I do not wish to cast any reflection at all upon the officers of the Legion, but they are not always men having trained legal minds. I would, therefore, suggest that this Committee offer to the Legion the services of the best legal mind we can secure in the Dominion of Canada for drafting and presenting their case, and by so doing he will help the Committee.

Mr. HEPBURN: If we do this, is it the intention to leave the doors wide open for the returned men to present all matters?