The Sumner commission has interpreted that clause as covering damages done to the civilian population while they were made prisoners of war, and the Sumner commission has so held. But to clarify any doubt as to the attitude of the British commission a cablegram was sent to the Canadian government office in London on November 22, 1930, reading as follows:

Ascertain from British reparation authorities what action if any was taken with regard to claims put in by military prisoners of war for injuries coming within section four Annex I article two three two treaty Versailles. Obtain particulars of any awards made and basis of settlement.

To this we received the following reply from the London office:

Your cable twenty-second. Ministry Pensions state all departments agreed in 1914 claims for personal injuries should be dealt with by Pensions ministry under ordinary provisions orders in council warrants relating soldiers and seamen. No further provisions to be made from public funds for special compensation. No difference made between injuries received prisoners of war or enemy action. Separate records claims while in captivity not available.

That was followed by a letter from the British ministry of pensions, referred to in this cable, reading as follows:

In reply to your letter of the 26th instant, I am directed by the Minister of Pensions to inform you that it was agreed in 1914 by the government departments concerned that claims for personal injuries sustained by members of the armed forces of the crown while in captivity in Germany should fall to be dealt with by the Ministry of Pensions under the ordinary provisions of the royal warrants, orders in council, et cetera, relating to soldiers, seamen, et cetera, and that no further provision need be made from public funds by way of special compensation on this account. It was not considered necessary to differentiate between injuries received by prisoners of war and those sustained otherwise as a result of enemy action, and separate records of claims in respect of injuries sustained while in captivity are not available.

It is therefore perfectly clear that no special allowances, compassionate or otherwise, were made to any members of His Majesty's forces in Great Britain who were made prisoner of war. Members of the Canadian forces, if they had been members of the British forces, would not have been permitted to make applications for reparations. They would not have received compensation in England except through the ordinary pension tribunals. Exceptional cases have been entertained by the Canadian reparations commissioners, and the awards to soldiers who were prisoners of war have been comparatively small as compared with the awards made to civilians who were prisoners of war. A great deal of complaint is made throughout the country that civilians are receiving better treatment than those who were serving in the naval and military forces of Canada when made prisoners of war. The circumstances of the naval and military claimants, and those of civilians, are entirely different. An enlisted member of the naval or military forces received his service pay, and if he was injured he received a pension. If he was captured by the enemy and detained in Germany as a prisoner of war his dependents were maintained at the public expense, and on his return to civil life he received his arrears of service pay, and a gratuity. If while a prisoner of war he suffered permanent physical injury he was entitled to receive a pension for life, just the same as if he had suffered physical injury on the field. On the other hand a civilian who became a prisoner of war was in a quite different position. If through misadventure he fell into the hands of the enemy and was taken prisoner his personal effects were lost, and his dependents received no compensation. On being allowed freedom he had no back pay to collect, and if maltreated or if he suffered injury while a prisoner of war he could not apply for pension, as could a member of the naval or military forces.

The differences in the situations when thus considered readily disclose that it is impossible to make any reasonable comparison between awards in civilian cases and in the cases of those in the naval or military services who became prisoners of war. For example, let us consider the merchant seaman who was captured at sea and interned or made prisoner of war in Germany, and possibly maltreated while a prisoner. He should be dealt with differently from the men engaged in the naval or military services. While a prisoner of war the merchant seaman received no pay; his dependents received no compensation; he received no service allowance or back pay; neither could he receive a pension from the public treasury. Therefore several of the reparations commissioners have felt that members of the merchant service resident or domiciled in Canada, who were made prisoners of war, should receive larger payments than the soldiers who were already receiving pensions ranging from thirty to ninety per cent for disability, and who were entitled from year to year throughout their lives to receive very considerable compensations.

Some of the lawyers throughout the country have been suggesting that those who were