

*By Mr. Isnor:*

Q. Would General McDonald give us the reason for that word "directly" being there?—A. That is just the point that Mr. Cleaver mentioned. That was intended to exclude the man who returns to hospital a long time after in connection with a disability that was not pensionable; it applies to the case of a man, we will say, who goes back to hospital for something else that he could not possibly have had in the army.

*By Mr. Cruickshank:*

Q. I am not just clear on that. What do you mean by, disability that was not pensionable?—A. Well, if you are pensionable; if you are a good case. Take a man who goes into hospital directly from the army for treatment, or for completion of treatment for amputation of his arm, and he is in hospital, if he dies as a result of that treatment anywhere, anytime, whether in the hospital or not, his widow would get a pension. I should think that this section is provided to apply to the period of treatment immediately following army service, which is really in effect a continuation of his army service. Although not actually enlisted it really is a continuation of his army service, because his treatment is being completed for some condition he got in the army. Now, this section applies to something else altogether.

Mr. ABBOTT: Say, measles.

Mr. CASSELMAN (*Grenville-Dundas*): Or pneumonia.

The WITNESS: Yes, or pneumonia.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: All right, take pneumonia, which is involved in the case to which I have drawn attention. As I understand the section it does not apply; the section says it must be in an actual theatre of war.

The WITNESS: That is the point stated by Mr. Cruickshank.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Here is a man who dies of pneumonia. He is not in the army. It is not his fault that he is not in the army. In this case he was conscripted, and therefore, he should be entitled to treatment. He contracts a disease and he dies. His dependents should be protected.

The WITNESS: That is the question that is to be decided by this committee.

*By Mr. Turgeon:*

Q. Is there a question here: If a man while actually in the army, before being handed over or in any other way being sent to a hospital, contracts a disease while actually in the army and then goes to the hospital and dies, he is not affected under this section at all, is he—if he dies from that disease? I am asking for information, and I would gather from this that he is not if he contracted the disease while in the army and then goes to the hospital and dies there from that disease. Isn't he pensionable in accordance with the relationship of the disease to pension?—A. Oh, yes.

Q. Regardless of the fact that he was in hospital?—A. Oh yes. The question of his being in hospital has no bearing on the ruling.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE: I think, with the consent of the committee, I should like to have the D.M.S. called on this very section at the next session. If that is agreeable to members of the committee we can postpone further discussion at this time.

Mr. BLANCHETTE: I think in the past we have been taking the cause on the basis of what a man has done by way of service, and I think we have been making it entirely too restricted. Most of us here are ex-service men and we know that we served where we were sent during the last war. Surely, it is not our fault if we were kept on this side; and I know that quite a number of the members of this committee have had the same experience in their counties

[Brigadier-General H. F. McDonald.]