

Now, if there is an appeal on the question of rateability, in case a man is rated by the Board of Pension Commissioners at 20 per cent, and under this clause he appeals against that rate to the Board of Appeal, and that Board agrees to raise his rateability to 40 per cent, and in the meantime his illness gets worse, the local officers of the Board in Vancouver might themselves recommend an increase of rate to 50 per cent. The situation would then be that he had been given 20 per cent by the Board of Pension Commissioners; he had appealed and secured a verdict of 40 per cent from the Court of Appeal; and the Board of Pension Commissioners, through their ordinary machinery, had increased the rate to 50 per cent. I mean, there is no finality; there cannot be. If an ex-service man is entitled to expect an increase of pension when his health is bad, he must have a decrease of pension when he gets better, and the intervention of a Board of Appeal which would seek to make a disability pension permanent is out of the question.

I have looked into this matter to some extent, and I find that of all the countries of the world, as far as I can learn, here is only one in which there is an appeal on rateability: that is England, and there it is allowed only when the disability is permanent, definite and fixed. Then there can be an appeal which is also definite.

But in a case such as we have here, where the man comes up for examination every six months and his pension rate is readjusted, if the Court of Appeal is to give final decision, you put an end to readjustments—adjustments up or adjustments down. Therefore I say that this clause is unworkable, and those who proposed it have forgotten what the rest of the law means, or is intended to do.

Section 15 was stricken out, as recommended.

On section 16—time allowed for appeals:

The Hon. the CHAIRMAN: This clause is amended by striking out subsection 3 and putting in place thereof the words:

The right of appeal shall be open for two years after the appointment of the Federal Appeal Board by the Governor in Council, or for one year after the decision complained of, whichever may be the later.

Section 16, as amended, was agreed to.

Section 17 was agreed to.

On section 18—final payment in cases of disability between 5 and 14 and 10 and 14 per cent:

The Hon. the CHAIRMAN: This is to be stricken out.

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH.

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: I understand the law as it stands is fairly satisfactory. There are some good elements in that, but it would not do a great deal of harm to let it go out.

Section 18 was stricken out, as recommended.

On section 19—new schedule:

The Hon. the CHAIRMAN: There is an amendment to this.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: Honourable gentleman, I was not present when the last two or three clauses were discussed by the Special Committee, and I submit to the members of that Committee, to the Senate, and to this Committee of the Whole the advisability of saying 1925 instead of 1924. This is carrying for another year the bonus which expires this autumn, viz., from 1924 to 1925. I have the impression that no change, or hardly any, will justify the alteration of the policy within one year, and I suggest that in order not to come back to Parliament, we should make it 1925.

The Hon. the CHAIRMAN: The figure 1924 is changed to 1925.

Section 19, as amended, was agreed to.

Section 20, as amended, was agreed to.

The schedules, as amended, were agreed to.

The title and the preamble were agreed to.

The Bill was reported, as amended.

THIRD READING

On motion of Hon. Mr. Dandurand, the Bill was read the third time and passed.

THE MONTREAL TERMINALS

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: Honourable gentleman, I was asked yesterday, I think by the honourable member for Inkerman (Hon. Smeaton White), whether the Canadian National Railway Board was considering the problems which arise in reference to the settlement of the terminals at Montreal. Those of us who pass through Montreal or who reside there recognize that there is a condition which needs to be remedied. I am informed by the Railway Department and by the Vice-President of the Railway Board that these problems are being studied with a view of bettering conditions and eliminating, if possible, some of the stations. This matter will naturally have to be studied jointly with the city authorities. All the plans—because there is more than one plan—will have to be discussed. There are to-day three schemes for the organization of proper terminals for the Canadian National Railways. There was a time when the Canadian National railway situation was a simple one. A tunnel has