

Mr. CASSELMAN (*Edmonton East*): Mr. Chairman, I think a lot of our conclusions arise from the underlying words of section (e). By using those words you are not giving the same width or breadth to the matter. In the first part it is stated "who has seen service during the great war." That service is not restricted to any place. But by adding these words you are putting a limitation upon the men who are in the present service. It will only apply to them if they are in a theatre of actual war as herein defined. I think we should make it the same for both. You can do that by saying "or who has seen service in the present war," instead of "in a theatre of actual war as herein defined."

The WITNESS: If you just left it out altogether, it would do that. On retirement from war service—just leave that out altogether.

Mr. CASSELMAN (*Edmonton East*): Of course, if you do not put that in at all you are just limiting it to those of the great war. It would not apply to the present war at all. But I think you get the thought I had in mind. It is just a question of wording it.

I should like at this moment to agree with what Mr. Cleaver has said about the distinction which should be made between those who voluntarily enlist and those who do not, as regards pensions for their injuries. But I think we should carry that a step further and make another distinction between those who are actually injured in a theatre of war; that is, those who are under the stress and strain of what is really active service, and those who are not under that stress and strain because they are not in an actual combat area. Our difficulty there seems to be in defining what is an actual theatre of war. The thought I tried to leave with the committee yesterday and which I want to emphasize again to-day is that in trying to define it we should keep in mind the idea of the injury having been received as a reasonably direct result of contact with the enemy. I am thinking of the terrible bomb explosion which occurred in London the other day where some of our men lost their lives. Surely that is direct contact with the enemy. And it does not matter whether it happens in London or Norwich or Southampton or on the continent or in Canada. If the same thing happens here in Canada, due to enemy action, that would be an actual theatre of war. We do not know how soon part of Canada may be in that category.

And in speaking about Iceland, how do we know that at this moment there is not a surface raider shelling the base in Iceland and injuries being inflicted on the men in that place? Would that not be an actual theatre of war? I think that in trying to define it geographically we should keep in mind a definition that will in some way link it up with actual combat with the enemy. We made the distinction before that a man who went to France was in an actual theatre of war. You and I know that there were thousands and thousands who went to France who were not in any more danger or were undergoing very little more stress or strain than those who were back in Canada training. There were certain areas in France that were combat areas, but there was a great deal of backfield area where the men were not under any more stress and strain than they were in England or perhaps in Canada. I want to leave that thought with the committee.

*By Mr. Mackenzie (Neepawa):*

Q. Are there any persons still in Canada who served in the last war yet to be discharged, or any persons anywhere?—A. No, none at all. The Canadian Expeditionary Force, as such, is completely demobilized.

Q. Then is there any use continuing that clause—"has seen service during the great war"?—A. Yes; we have to maintain the authority for the pensions we are now paying. If that were taken away there would be no basis at all for the awards, and the Auditor-General would say, "What power have you to pay those pensions?"