

Concerning those who were enlisted in the regular force before this and while the emergency was on, I think the feeling was that they had enlisted on a regular engagement and they knew the terms and there was no obligation to apply these additional benefits to them. And furthermore, as I mentioned in another connection, it was desired to keep them in the service at that time, but at present this will apply practically without exception to those in the regular forces in the army because it is over three years since the 5th of July, 1950, and the engagements are all for a three year period—

Mr. GILLIS: I think the reasoning is all wrong. It is pretty hard for a man who has been in the army for five or six years and who has served in Korea and comes back to understand why he is not entitled to unemployment insurance while men who went in two or three years after him are receiving it. I think it is an oversight. I have had a few cases of it and I could not understand it. I am reasonably sure that the great majority of men who went in prior to 1950 do not understand it either. I would suggest before this committee rises it should at least make some recommendation concerning it. There are a lot of boys coming out of the service today who are discovering they are not entitled to unemployment insurance and I believe we should make some recommendation concerning that.

The CHAIRMAN: I see in the bill, Mr. Gillis, it provides for the man who has been discharged on medical grounds for disability relating to his service in the theatre of operation. In other words, as I understand the bill, if a person was a member of the regular forces and served in the theatre of operations on the strength of the special force, he gets benefits under this Act if he is discharged for a disability relating to his service but, as I understand it, if his period of engagement comes to an end in the ordinary way then he gets the same treatment as any other member of the regular forces because, as I understand it, when he joined up it was contemplated he would serve a set period of time and he gets the benefit of it only if he is discharged ahead of time due to a disability incurred during or resulting from service.

Mr. GILLIS: The ones I am talking about had no disability and they found they are in a class by themselves. I do not think special classes should be set up.

The CHAIRMAN: If you extend it to those members of the regular forces who served the same as any other member of the regular forces and who served their full period of time and then took their discharge; then anyone else who served in the regular forces, say in Germany, would feel he was entitled, too.

Mr. GREEN: But does the man who is in a regular force derive none of the benefits by reason of having served?

The CHAIRMAN: That brings up the general question again. General Burns, what benefit does a member of the regular force get by virtue of having served in the special force in Korea over and above what he would get if he had served in Germany?

Mr. Green desires to clear that up. Are there any benefits received by virtue of having served in the special force which he would not get otherwise?

The WITNESS: If some condition develops which he thinks was attributable to or incurred during service he has the privilege of trying to get a pension and he is entitled to training and reestablishment credit and gratuity and benefits under the Veterans' Land Act.

*By Mr. Green:*

Q. If you grant that he is entitled to those benefits why should he not get the benefit of the unemployment insurance clause? I would like an answer to the question.—A. It would be rather difficult to draw up the terms under