

*By Mr. Green:*

Q. How does the man who has not any war service qualify for pension under that section of the Act?—A. He qualifies for it.

Mr. CLEAVER: Every man who enlists qualifies.

The WITNESS: Yes. Every man in the forces during the war has war service.

*By Mr. Green:*

Q. No. You said the Act covered men who served. You said that military service covered a man who did not serve in the war but who served in the forces between the last war and this one?—A. Or after this war.

Q. What I should like to know is under what section of the Act that man gets his pension? He cannot qualify under section 11 because it is confined to war service.

Mr. TURGEON: He comes under sub-section 2.

The WITNESS: Yes, sub-section 2; under what we used to call the old section.

*By Mr. Green:*

Q. He is under new sub-section 2 of section 11?—A. Yes. The same provision is made in the present Act for him, except that the service is described as military service other than war service. In the old section it was described as military service after the war.

The CHAIRMAN: The next is sub-section (c).

The WITNESS: In subsection (c) there is no change.

*By Mr. Casselman (Grenville-Dundas):*

Q. I should like to ask a question with respect to subsection (c). It says, "was not of a nature to cause rejection from service". Could that not be clarified? You have the previous words, "wilfully concealed, was obvious". I think if we have instead of the words "to cause rejection from service" something along this line, "capable of being noted on examination at the time of enlistment" that would do away with a lot of the difficulty.—A. Yes. It is a very difficult phraseology to administer, and it has not been used very much. It has been used very rarely.

Q. I have run up against it in two or three cases.—A. I mean, for instance, the case of a man who might have had the little finger off his left hand.

Q. I should like to see that wording, "that is capable of being noted at the time of enlistment", because as it is now, it leaves it wide open for anything to happen when a man comes up to make application for pension.—A. Yes.

*By Hon. Mr. Mackenzie:*

Q. How long has this been in the Act?—A. That has been in since time immemorial.

*By Mr. Casselman:*

Q. I think it has been in the Act for a long time?—A. Yes, a long time. It is honoured more in the breach than in the observance, I think.

Q. I have never been able to get it followed in the breach. That is my predicament.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE: Suppose we look at that point later before the next session of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN: The next section is subsection (d).