

The Problem of the Disabled Soldier

BY

THOMAS L. JARROTT

Reprinted from **The University Magazine,**
April, 1917

**THE
PROBLEM
OF THE
DISABLED
SOLDIER**

There is still another article in the present number to which special attention should be called. Entitled "The Problem of the Disabled Soldier," it discusses in general terms the principles that should be followed by Canada in caring for those members of her armed forces who have become disabled. Obviously this is only part of a still larger problem which centres in the need of providing for the return of all soldiers and sailors to civilian life when their military duties are over. However, the obligation to help the disabled comes first in point of emergency.

One need not enumerate the palpable and cogent reasons which place this whole subject in the forefront of national interests at the present time. How to deal with our veterans in a manner which shall be at once generous, just and reasonable is a task worthy of the best capacity we possess. The theory of the pension must not be taken up lightheartedly, but with the utmost thoroughness, and the regulations established must be carried out in complete good faith, or we shall drift inevitably into practices which awaken our keen criticism when we see them in operation elsewhere. In the United States, it is said, one man applied for a pension on the ground that he had been wounded in his substitute, while another supported his claim by stating that he had read all the war articles in the *Century Magazine*. Since human nature is what it is, a strong effort will doubtless be made at some time to render our own pension act a kind of pork barrel. And apart from any other consideration, practices of this kind must inevitably tend to prejudice the interests of the deserving veteran by permitting an unjust participation by those who are not deserving. Hence from the standpoint alike of theory as crystallized in law, and of administration, the Pension Question is one of the largest in our political foreground.

Fortunately the world has advanced a great deal since 1865 when the close of the American Civil War furnished a classic object lesson of the way in which returned soldiers

should not be treated. Among modern improvements none is so conspicuous as that of thorough vocational training which modern governments—or, at least, the more intelligent among them—are providing for the disabled soldier. No one can have read the current newspapers and periodicals without encountering descriptions of the magnificent work which France, particularly, has done in this field. The shattered survivors of Nancy, the Marne, the Champagne offensive, and the Verdun defense are being trained systematically with a view to insuring their future usefulness and happiness. It is an object lesson which will cause Canadians shame unless we take similar steps to render our own heroes something more than the recipients of an income—whether that income be supplied by the state or by individuals.

To itemize the many and multiform considerations which are bound up with the problem of the disabled soldier would be beyond the scope of a mere note. But it is hoped that these few words may act as a fingerpost, directing all patriotic readers to the article on this subject which stands among the special features of the present number.

THE PROBLEM OF THE DISABLED SOLDIER

NEXT after fighting, the question which most concerns warring nations is "How are Soldiers and Sailors to be returned to Civilian Life?" That this question is exercising the belligerent governments is evident from the number of allusions made to it by public men and by the number of publications dealing with it. It is an interesting commentary upon the nature of the question and upon its importance that the warring nations have adopted measures that are almost identical. Differences in the measures adopted depend not upon any fundamental difference in the principles underlying them, but upon differences in the social organization of the nation for which they are designed.

When the war ends, armies will be disbanded. Each of the nations has plans for demobilization. The problem dealt with is a difficult one; upon its correct solution much depends. It is, for many reasons, of great national importance that men should find a satisfactory place in civilian life so soon as they are no longer needed as soldiers. The volume of men returning to Canada for whom channels to civilian life must be opened is small at present; from now on, it will increase steadily until some months after Peace is signed. Then it will diminish. It will cease when the last of the store-keepers, record-makers, paymasters and odd-job men of our army is at home.

Profitable discussion of measures by which soldiers may be replaced quickly in civilian life cannot be commenced until the principles governing those measures are clearly understood. After a very short consideration of the question, it is seen that three factors are of decisive importance in the conduct and design of the measures by which provision will be made for the return of Canadian soldiers to their places

in civilian life. The first is our determination that the measures adopted shall be ideal for their purpose and that they shall be administered with the broadest good-will towards our men. The second factor, no less important but less evident, is that though the problem of providing for the return of our soldiers has many sides, it is but one problem and must be considered in a single co-ordinated plan, comprehensive in its design, if it is to be solved rightly. The third is—it is very necessary, if success is to be attained—that sound measures should be thought out and followed from the commencement; the failures of other nations prove this.

Like many other nations, Canada provides an elaborate machinery for removing a man from civil to military life. She is like other nations also in that the machinery by which she returns the men of her forces to civilian life is less perfect than that by which they are recruited. The situation should be reversed. The man who joins an armed force is assured a position so long as he remains a soldier or sailor. The man who leaves an army or navy becomes a civilian. At once, he is thrown upon his own resources and must commence to gain a livelihood in competition with his fellows; in fairness, no man should be subjected to such hazard until he is fitted to cope with it.

If the measures adopted by other nations in providing for returning soldiers be studied, it is apparent that the mere adoption of their laws will not suffice to meet the situation which will be created in Canada by the return of Canadian men, disabled or sound, during and after the war. It is so for two reasons; first, because Canadian laws, to be useful, must be based upon and be designed to meet Canadian conditions; second, because the laws under which other countries are dealing with the problem of their returning men are undergoing great changes. Canada is a new nation, and has developed distinct, national characteristics. Though similar, the customs and spirit of our social organization are not identical with those of other peoples who enjoy responsible government. Consequently, a study of the methods followed by

others in dealing with a problem, such as the return of ex-soldiers to civilian life, may suggest useful and parallel methods for meeting a similar problem in Canada; but it does not follow that the methods found applicable and useful to another country can be usefully employed in Canada.

In order that the problem may be wisely discussed it is of advantage to consider the precise conditions under which Canada has put her forces in the field and on the sea. Then, guided by the experience and example of other nations and governed by a clear perception of the Canadian situation, it may be possible to outline methods applicable and adequate for Canada. Canada has a democratic form of government. By its organization and by his vote, each Canadian has his share in the direction of the nation; every Canadian is a part of the Canadian State; that State is inherent in its citizens and has no existence outside them.

War is the ultimate means by which a State insists upon a realization of its national policy. Canada is at war. Canadians are fighting, more than for any other reason, because they are determined to secure to themselves and to their children continued existence in the democratic form of government which they now enjoy.

Canadians have engaged in the war as in a common enterprise undertaken for the benefit of the State of which each is a part; they are fighting to maintain that form of government which secures to each of them a voice in the direction of his country's affairs. Therefore, each Canadian should profit, or suffer, equally with his fellows from the success, or distress, resulting from his country's engagement in the war.

Armies and navies are the implements with which nations make war. Armies and navies are formed by soldiers and sailors. Soldiers and sailors, in Canada, are citizens who have been delegated by the State to spend their whole energies in the public service. They must suffer, by reason of their service, no greater detriment than do fellow-citizens whose energies during the war have been employed in other occupations.

This is like no preceding war. It is a war of nations, not of armies. As a result, old methods of providing for ex-soldiers have been found inadequate and new legislation to meet new conditions is being devised and enforced. France and England, for example, are re-modelling their laws; Canada, which had practically no laws for dealing with ex-soldiers when war commenced, will find it necessary to devise a whole procedure for that purpose. The laws by which France is providing for the return to civilian life of those who have served in her "Armies of the land and sea" are characteristically detailed in their provisions. They are governed in their design by principles similar to those which define the obligation of Canada towards her citizen soldiers and sailors. There is great similarity between these principles and those underlying much of the recent legislation providing compensation for workmen injured at their employment. There is sound reason in that similarity. Modern workmen's compensation laws, such as those of the Province of Ontario, look upon the charge for insuring workmen against unavoidable accident as an item in the cost of producing articles manufactured:—about 86% of the industrial accidents occurring in Germany in 1887 were unavoidable. It follows that the cost of insurance should be added to the price of the article manufactured, and that it should be borne by the consumer; the insurance is a part of the cost of the commodity which he purchases.

Canadians are, in a sense, partners in business. They are engaged in the business of maintaining the State of which each of them is a part. Under the terms of their agreement—the Militia Act—every Canadian can be called upon to defend the Dominion. War is a social risk. Canada engaged in the business of Statehood becomes involved in that risk. Through the involvement many Canadians must suffer. It is evidently but right, to continue the metaphor, that losses resulting from the nation's warfare should be equally distributed among the partners. It follows that no Canadian should suffer through the war more than does his fellow-

citizen. Since those who suffer do so on behalf of the nation, it is the duty of all those who compose the nation to suffer with them. In Canada, it is the nation, the Dominion as a whole, and not provincial or civic governments, nor organizations supported by private citizens, which must bear the whole responsibility for the proper return of Canada's ex-soldiers and ex-sailors to civilian life.

That the Dominion Government—the Canadian Nation—is so responsible, cannot be too clearly understood. While the bodies entrusted with realizing the nation's responsibility conceivably may be permitted to accept private benevolence when it is offered, the responsibility remains a national one. Any system of caring for returning men which, in any part, directly depends upon private benevolence is, upon the face of it, an improper system. It delegates a public function to a private body. To vest a private body with any share of that responsibility would constitute an evasion of the nation's obligation to make good disabilities incurred by its citizens in warfare. To do so would produce a situation intolerable alike to those who received benefits and to those, Canadians also, who wished to pay their debts to their fellows.

It is only under responsible government, where the State is the people and exists to serve the people, that the recognition of a warring nation's responsibility to its citizens approaches such completeness as that outlined. It is only by such governments that consistent attempts are made to distribute equally among the individuals composing the nation, detriments which by the chances of war have fallen unequally upon them. The obligation of a State to provide for the equalization of all losses inflicted on its citizens, whether combatant or not, by a national enemy is receiving more general recognition. All of the warring nations have widened the scope of the laws by which they provide compensation for deaths and for bodily or mental incapacitation resulting from service in army or navy. In addition, legislation has been introduced, for example by Great Britain and by France, with the object, under circumstances as yet comparatively

limited, of compensating citizens for material and economic damage which they have suffered directly or indirectly through enemy acts. In England, measures have been introduced for the compensation of those who suffer damage by the raids of Zeppelins and of the German Fleet; in France, the Government has stated that all property loss, suffered in the invaded districts, will be entirely made good.

This article avoids all discussion of the desirability of compensating from national resources citizens, whether combatant or non-combatant, who have suffered financial loss from acts of the King's enemies. It discusses only the obligation of Canada to compensate Canadians for bodily or mental disability which they have incurred by reason of their service as soldiers or sailors. Though "The Problem of the Disabled Soldier" is an important matter, it is but one of the difficult questions closely associated with the demobilization of our forces.

Every Canadian should have a clear idea of what must be done for returning men, disabled through their service. Perhaps because of the nature of wars in the past some of us are inclined to believe that an ex-soldier, especially if he has been wounded, is entitled to a reward—a pension—sufficient to support him and his family almost in idleness to the end of their days. This may be an accurate conception of what a pension ought to have been in times when soldiers were rewarded by those in whose interests they fought. It is not a proper conception of the compensation due from Canada to one of her disabled men—Canadians are fighting for themselves. The compensation due to them is not a gift from Canada as a reward for good service done. It is a value, paid as a right by Canadians, through their Government, to those of their fellow-citizens who have been incapacitated by a personal detriment incurred in performing public service. Compensation is made so that those who receive it may be able, on equal terms and unhandicapped by their disability, to live in competition with those of their fellows who have not been incapacitated. The obligation to work, to be self-

supporting and to provide for his dependents, exists for an ex-soldier just as it does for every Canadian citizen. That ex-soldiers, or their dependents, receive a pension does not relieve them, either in their own eyes or in those of their fellows, from an obligation to work according to their abilities and to support themselves if they can.

Though this is an accurate statement of the relation existing between Canada and the men of her forces, the issue is somewhat confused by our voluntary system of recruiting, which permits individuals to decide for themselves whether they are or are not to serve. It is sometimes maintained that men who volunteer for military service should receive greater consideration than has been suggested in the preceding paragraphs. It is conceivable that it might be so in the case of a group of individuals engaged, preferably under a definite agreement, for service in operations of a special nature. For example, the members of the Permanent Force in Canada, on their enlistment, come under an agreement by which they receive a certain salary and certain pension benefits at the termination of a definite period of service. Those who enlist in the Permanent Force of the Canadian Militia do so voluntarily, and the payment of the pension benefit is a part of the contract under which they enlist. The conditions of that contract should be fulfilled in the same way as are those of any other agreement. Nevertheless, there will be no justification, in the present war, for giving greater consideration to those who volunteer for service than that outlined. If the war lasts much longer military service for able-bodied men practically will have become universal in Canada. When such a situation exists, those who volunteered and served first will have a distinct advantage over those who enlisted at a later date, either voluntarily or under moral or legal compulsion. About 400,000 men have already joined the Canadian Expeditionary Force; an enlistment of 500,000 men has been authorized. To enlist that number will tax Canadian resources severely. It is questionable whether it will be possible to do so without resorting to some measure

of obligatory service. Should service become obligatory, enrollment by ballot, as provided for by the Militia Act, might be employed. Should considerably more than 500,000 men actually be enrolled, service would become so universal in Canada that in fact, as in the theory of the Militia Act, Canadians would be living under conditions requiring military service from almost every male able to bear arms. Under such circumstances, any claim to special consideration would pass from those who volunteered before service became universal; because every Canadian would be equally liable for service. Indeed, those who volunteered and became soldiers first, by their early enlistment would have gained advantage over those who followed them. Those who joined first, because of the length of their service, would have greater opportunity of earning commissions and consequently, under existing regulations, of obtaining higher rates of pay and of pension. Again, those disabled and discharged from the service early in the war would have an advantage over those in similar circumstances, who returned to civilian life after them. Those first discharged would have an opportunity of becoming established in civil life before the commencement of the "hard times" and keen competition which will certainly accompany the disbandment of armies and the readjustment of conditions at the end of the war.

The population of Canada numbers something over 7,000,000. We intend to enroll about 500,000 in our armed forces. It follows that, at the end of the war, about a fourteenth of the total population of Canada will return, in a comparatively short period, from military to civilian life. That fraction will include a very considerable proportion of Canadian voters. The experience of the United States provides an excellent example of the abuses which may result when the votes of ex-soldiers and of ex-sailors are permitted to become a factor in the political situation of a country organized under a representative form of government and subjected to the ineptitudes of party politics. The pension evil in the United States has reached great dimensions. (In June, 1916,

war pensions were costing the United States \$159,000,000 yearly; a recently passed law adds several more millions to that total.) Its creation and perpetuation have resulted, in part, from allowing the treatment of old soldiers and sailors to become a question bandied between political parties and bid upon at successive elections. The result has been that administrations have distributed benefits to veterans and their dependents with a free-handed lack of consideration, not altogether to be justified.

Canadians, in many districts, are extremely like the citizens of the United States. Veterans' associations already exist in Canada. Nothing can be more certain than that returning Canadian soldiers and sailors will use their associations in order to express and secure redress for real or imagined cause for dissatisfaction with the arrangements made by the Government for their return to civilian life. It would be unfortunate if false ideas of what Canada owes, and can give, her soldiers should become general, and if societies should be formed for the purpose of urging unreasonable claims by political propaganda. The danger which such a situation might present to a country possessing a representative form of government is great; the political power commanded by a seventh of its voters is enormous. The danger will be removed when there is a sound understanding among us of the whole problem presented by the return of disabled men from our forces. Once such an understanding exists, all danger will disappear if forethought provides wisely-drawn legislation and devises machinery adequate for its administration and execution.

It will not be difficult to spread sound views concerning the pensions and other benefits which must be provided for our disabled men, if the matter be discussed freely. It is necessary that sound views should become universal; already some of us have a wrong idea of what a pension should be. Steps cannot be taken too soon to counteract any inclination towards a belief that a sturdy man should be able to rely upon his pension alone for his livelihood. The public-spirited

Canadian citizen-soldiers who have been disabled by their service and are receiving pensions would be among the first to resent the granting of pensions to men unentitled to them by reason of a disability incurred in military or naval service. They would not be slow to ask, "Why should public money be given to men who have suffered nothing by their service to the State? Why should such men be supported by the labour of their fellow-citizens?"

The manner in which French public opinion on these matters was formed to sound lines is very striking. At first, there was a universal tendency to assume that there is nothing left for a disabled man but a lifetime of stagnation as an idle pensioner. A definite policy of public instruction was commenced. In it every method of conveying information was used with all the prestige and authority that official approval could lend. Newspapers, magazines, posters, clergy, trades' unions, manufacturers' associations, boards of trade, public service corporations, all united in insisting upon the dual obligation existing between the State and its citizens: There is an obligation upon the State to insure an independent position to those who have been disabled in its service; and there is an obligation upon the citizen, both to be self-supporting in the measure of the ability remaining to him and to receive from his fellow-citizens no more than is his due. There are few in France, now, who have not a sound understanding of the circumstances in which a disabled man is discharged from military service. It is much less usual, now, for a disabled soldier to refuse the treatment by which his disability might be lessened or for him to decline the vocational training by which he might be made self-supporting. At the commencement of the war the situation was otherwise. The change in public opinion is due to the teaching of men such as Barrès, Brioux, Brisac, Capus, and so on down the alphabet. They stated, with all the emphasis at their command, the measures which should be adopted in providing for the return of ex-soldiers to civilian life. They did much to teach France that it is not enough to say "poor fellow" in seeing a wounded

man. They insisted that what must be said is "there is a man to whom the possibility of a self-earned livelihood must be assured." The kindest thing that can be done for a blind man is not to guide him, but to teach him to guide himself; in the same way, there is little benevolence in contributing to the dependence of a wounded soldier. The truest kindness to him is that which can exclaim "thanks to me, there is a man who no longer needs help."

Brieux draws a wise comparison between children and disabled men. For the moment, a man disabled in the war needs the same care as does a child. Like a child he must be supported and educated. A man who has been severely wounded or has suffered an amputation is himself neither physically nor mentally. It takes some time before complete equilibrium is recovered after so violent a shock; there are some who never become completely themselves; such weakness increases the country's obligations to its disabled. It is not enough to secure a comfortable livelihood to disabled men. They must also be assured self-respect and confidence in themselves. They must not only receive pensions but they must be made capable of supporting themselves. Sometimes it is difficult to persuade men to accept the treatment and education necessary to attain that end. In continuing his comparison between children and disabled men Brieux writes: "Everyone knows how easy it is to gain the affections of a child by spoiling it. Parents who do so are fortunate if they never know the unhappiness which they have caused to those whom they have loved unwisely. They are fortunate, too, if they never hear reproaches from children who have learned that they have a right to make them."

By wise provision Canada can make certain that the future will bring no reproaches from those of her children who have fought for her. As their need demands, their injuries should be treated; they should receive pension and they should be given instruction and opportunities enabling them to support themselves. Four conditions must be satisfied before a disabled soldier can be considered to have become

capable of working effectively and of supporting himself in competition with his fellows. The four conditions are stated in the following sentences. They are discussed in subsequent paragraphs.

Bodily or mental disability due to military service must be brought to an irreducible minimum.

When it is necessary and possible, disabled men must be taught an occupation in order that they may become employable.

If it is necessary, ex-soldiers must be assisted in obtaining employment.

Pensions and other advantages must be given in compensation for any disability resulting from military service; the magnitude of the pension and of other advantages will vary in accordance with the extent of the disability in respect of which they are awarded.

Each of these conditions must be satisfied; but it cannot be too clearly understood that the provision of an adequate pension is the least important of the measures by which the personal rehabilitation of disabled soldiers and sailors may be secured.

With us, responsibility for bringing disabilities of body or mind to an irreducible minimum is divided between the Canadian Army Medical Corps and the Military Hospitals Commission. The Canadian Army Medical Corps is concerned more intimately with giving the active medical and surgical treatment required by men overseas. The Military Hospitals Commission limits its activities more or less completely to caring for men in Canada who are convalescent or require treatment of a special nature; the Commission is also responsible for the provision of appropriate vocational training. Disabilities are reduced, not only by everything that care and skilled treatment can do, but also by the provision of artificial limbs and other appliances, which will be renewed and kept in repair as may be necessary by the Government. Treatment is given to men while they are inmates of hospitals, military or civilian, or, exceptionally, as out-

patients while they are living at their own homes. While the repair of a soldier's injuries is the prime object of all treatment, attention can scarcely be paid too soon to the renewal in him of an ability and a wish to be once more at work, a self-supporting man. The experience of Allies and Central Powers alike shows very definitely that it is better for disabled men, so soon as their need for active hospital treatment permits it, to be cared for in an institution where they receive, concurrently, both secondary treatment and, as early as possible, appropriate light work and vocational training. It is a grave mistake, not only from a social but from a therapeutic point of view, to permit disabled men to remain in convalescent homes where they receive only "medical treatment," and are permitted either to idle or to spend their time in so-called amusements or in desultory exercises of a pointless nature. In order to stimulate interest in vocational training, and in order to keep an ambition to be earning active in disabled soldiers, it has been found advisable to pay men, from the beginning, for work done during training, in accordance with its quantity and excellence.

In choosing the occupation for which a man is to be trained, his inclinations, his previous experience, his physical and mental capacity, and his present condition must be considered. A sound choice can only be made by experienced advisors who have expert knowledge of occupations, of the qualities required by those who are successful in them, and of Canadian conditions. As a rule, a man should be trained in some branch of an occupation with which he is already acquainted. Experience shows that there are very few among the disabled who cannot be made fit for some employment, if they are trained by competent persons. There will be a few who will be unable to support themselves in ordinary commerce. For them it may be found necessary to establish special colonies or State-assisted workshops; every effort should be made to make those working in such institutions believe that they are actually supporting themselves.

It is probable that in Canada, as on the other side of the Atlantic, a few soldiers, anxious to return to their homes, will refuse to accept the treatment and vocational training offered to them. All Canadians, soldiers and others, should understand that disabled men who refuse to take advantage of the opportunities for treatment and for training offered to them do so at grave cost to themselves. A man who unreasonably refuses to accept the treatment and training made desirable by his disability penalizes himself; by his own choice he remains less capable of supporting himself than he might be. Moreover, such a man cannot expect to be pensioned for the entire disability existing in him; but only for that portion of the disability which would exist were he to accept reasonable treatment. He cannot expect to be pensioned for a disability remaining unnecessarily great because of his unreasonable refusal to accept simple treatment, any more than he could expect to be pensioned for a disability arising from a wilfully self-inflicted wound. In France, indeed, it is anticipated by many that the acceptance of appropriate treatment and of appropriate vocational training will be made a military necessity for disabled men. While such a thing could scarcely come about in Canada, it should be clearly understood by all Canadians that appropriate, and often prolonged, medical treatment, the provision of artificial appliances, vocational training and assistance in obtaining employment, are all just as much a part of Canada's attempt to rehabilitate a disabled man as is the pension granted to him. Of these things the pension is, indeed, immeasurably the least important.

Many plans have been proposed and are being followed in finding employment for disabled men. Each of the nations in making appointments to positions controlled by the government is giving preference, other things being equal among competent applicants, to men disabled by military service. France has opened a special bureau for the purpose of finding employment for disabled soldiers; in Canada, the Provincial Soldiers' Aid Commissions are serving a similar purpose.

France is also arranging to remove a serious disadvantage, which would otherwise prevent employers from engaging disabled men, by providing a scheme of insurance which will relieve employers from liability for the accidents to which disabled men, by reason of their disabilities, are especially exposed. A bill has even been proposed suggesting that all manufacturers should be forced to employ a certain proportion of disabled men among their operatives. In Canada, Provincial Governments and certain great corporations have devised schemes of settlement by which returning soldiers will be assisted in establishing themselves upon farms; France and England have adopted elaborate measures with a similar purpose. In France, arrangements have been made for advancing capital to a disabled man so that he may support himself on his farm, if he is an agriculturist, or in his shop, if he is an artisan, until he is firmly established.

A pension is a sum of money given to disabled men, or to their dependents, in order to enable them to live in decent comfort. The amount of the pension received by a disabled man varies in accordance with the extent of the disability in respect of which it has been granted. The extent to which a man is disabled by a given injury is estimated by medical officers; these physicians and surgeons are guided in their estimation by a consideration of the disablement observed to have resulted in other persons who have been similarly injured. A totally disabled Canadian private soldier, or able-bodied seaman, receives \$480 a year; if he is so severely disabled as to require the services of an attendant he may also be granted not more than \$250 yearly. He also receives \$72 yearly for each of his children. Pensions are awarded to members of the Canadian Expeditionary Force only for disability. Pensions are unaffected by a man's occupation, by his earning power, or income, or social position. They vary in accordance with the rank of the man disabled, but are unaffected by the length of his service. In Canada, exclusive jurisdiction over the granting and refusal of pensions is vested in a Board of Pension Commissioners.

Careful treatment, the provision of the best artificial appliances, appropriate vocational training, assistance in obtaining suitable employment, and the granting of adequate pensions will permit almost every one of our disabled men to find an individual place for himself in the social organization of his country; each will become a wage-earner or perhaps a lodger, unable to work but supported by a pension ensuring him decent comfort in some household. Consequently, there will be but few homeless, helpless men for whom it will be necessary to provide special institutions; with the exception of the insane and of the tubercular, such men will be hopeless cripples. Together, these three classes constitute the only ex-soldiers who will remain permanently in the care of the State. Whether it will be necessary to establish "Homes for Old Soldiers" and other institutions to care for them will depend largely upon their number. If they are many, homes will be necessary; if they are few, it will be advantageous to care for them in existing institutions.

It is evident that "The Problem of the Disabled Soldier" is a large and complicated one. At present, its solution is being sought through the activities of several bodies controlled by Federal and Provincial Governments. The problem is a huge one. It affects a large proportion of our population. It touches every aspect of our social organization. It vitally concerns two generations of Canadians.

It is a commonplace that the direction of all affairs of great magnitude should be divided into two parts, an administrative body and executive agencies. A central administrative body should issue instructions based upon a considered and clearly-defined policy. The instructions of an administration should be realized by numerous executive agencies, each closely connected with the field of its operations. France has realized the necessity for central control in dealing with her disabled men; although there are difficulties in the way, it seems probable that the Office Nationale des Mutilés et Reformés de la Guerre will ultimately become a central administrative body directing and co-ordinating all measures

adopted by France for the proper return of disabled members of her armed forces to civilian life. There is ground for hoping that, in Great Britain, the recently established Ministry of Pensions may fulfil a similar purpose.

This discussion of "The Problem of the Disabled Soldier" deals only with the rehabilitation of personal detriments incurred by soldiers and sailors during their service. A short experience, or a little thought, will show that disabled men often suffer from hardships existing for us all, soldiers and civilians alike; some of these are lack of education, illness, sudden death. When disabled soldiers and sailors, or their dependents, are affected by misfortunes such as these—unconnected with their military or naval service—are they to receive public assistance? If assistance is rendered them it should be clearly understood that the aid is given, not as a debt owed by the State—the rehabilitation of men disabled by military service *is owed* to them—but that it is given as a reward, as a mark of public appreciation for meritorious service. (It cannot be too clearly understood that Canada's obligation to the disabled members of her forces has been met when all detriments resulting from their service have wholly been made good to them.) Hardships, consequent upon existence or inadequacies of our social system, to which we are all liable, become striking when they affect disabled soldiers and sailors. If soldiers and sailors affected by such hardships are to be aided from public resources, it should be clear that the aid is given as a gift and not as a benefit to which military service has created a right. If that distinction is maintained, it may become possible later to extend to all of our citizens proper methods of dealing with hardships adequately met for the first time when they affected our disabled men.

A constant source of hardship, often made evident by the war, is the lack of provision, under our social system, for the dependents of men who are no longer able to supply support when they become inactive through vice, sickness or imprisonment. To-day, if a civilian becomes insane from the after-effects of venereal disease, or if he is a chronic

drunkard, or if he goes to the penitentiary or is executed for crime, his dependents must be supported by themselves and their friends, or turn to the charity of the community. Are the dependents of soldiers and sailors, in similar circumstances, to be supported by the State? If so, since the occurrence which removed their support is unconnected with military or naval service, a similar benefit should be extended to the dependents of all citizens.

The inadequacy of our educational system becomes very apparent when a full-grown Canadian, a returned soldier, about to leave a hospital cured of a transient disablement begs to be retained for a little longer in order that his primary education may be completed. Is Canada, under the Order-in-Council which provides vocational training for disabled soldiers, to continue the education which such a man should have received as a child? If it is done for the disabled soldier, since the lack of education was in no wise dependent upon his military service, a means of obtaining knowledge should exist for every citizen who desires it.

A civilian suffering from tuberculosis is permitted, restrained by nothing but the degree of his incapacity, to circulate among his fellows, often to his own detriment and to the danger of those among whom he moves. Can advantage be taken of the peculiar situation of soldiers or sailors suffering from tuberculosis to place restrictions upon them—for the benefit of themselves and their fellows—which are not placed upon civilians? It should be done for soldiers; it is but one of the things which should be done for us all under the authority of a not-yet-established Federal Department of Public Health.

If these and similar hardships, unconnected with military service, affecting disabled men, be dealt with adequately, the first step will have been taken towards remedying some of those defects in our national organization which stress of war has made very plain.