parked on a lot located near the building occupied by a certain company in Winnipeg. The article goes on to say:

The foursome ran to the area to investigate when a man jumped out of a truck, knocked—

The soldier in question—

—down, jumped back in and hurriedly drove off.

Then the next paragraph begins with this man's name, which I am deliberately omitting, and states that this man—

—whose head struck the ground, was picked up in a semi-conscious condition by an army provost vehicle and taken to Fort Osborne barracks. From there, he was transported by ambulance to Deer Lodge hospital.

For a number of days his life hung in the balance. He was cared for most efficiently and effectively at Deer Lodge hospital. In due course he was released from the hospital and permitted to go home. It was understood, however, that it would be some considerable time before he would be able to go back to his work. Indeed, he was not to go to work until he was given his release. In other words, he was not discharged from full-time service until it was possible for him to return to his civilian employment. His hospitalization was fully paid for, and he was kept on full pay and allowances as long as he was in the hospital. But when he was released from the hospital and sent home, although he was still on the roll, no provision for pay and allowances was made for him. He tells me that he understood from the medical officer at Deer Lodge hospital that he would be paid for that period. In addition to that, when he received a cheque on August 9 from the Receiver General of Canada there was with it a notation which read:

The above cheque covers hospital period May 28 to June 9, 1950 only; the balance, June 10 to July 9 will have to be authorized by army headquarters.

When I took this matter up with the minister—and may I say he has been good enough to go into the case—he replied to my reference to that notation the soldier received from the Receiver General of Canada by saying that this "notice is not understood, as there are no regulations whereby army headquarters or the minister's department may grant pay and allowances to a soldier of the reserve force following discharge from hospital, where the injury is not attributable to the performance of duty."

I realize the line that can be drawn here, that the accident did not occur while he was on military operations as such, and did not occur while he was building dikes or doing any work in particular in connection with the flood. However, it did occur while he and his companions were on the way home. As the minister says in his letter of November 10, he held an authorized pass. Yet the minister says the regulations prohibited the department from granting this soldier the pay and allowances he was led to believe he would receive for the time he was home on convalescent leave. This chap had a position with Eaton's when he was called up, and of course his pay there stopped. That company could not be expected to keep him on pay until he was able to return to work. So he lost remuneration for a period of three or four weeks, and it created quite a problem for him.

I note that this resolution proposes to deal with the payment of compensation in respect of death or disability of persons employed in or with the public service of Canada, and so on. It is fortunate that this chap's danger of death did not materialize that way; but his disability proved to be a matter of serious inconvenience in financial terms. I am wondering whether the bill to be brought in on the basis of this resolution will take care of a situation like that. I have given the minister particulars of an actual rather than a hypothetical case. On a hypothetical basis one could think of a situation much worse. Will this legislation take care of a situation of that kind?

Mr. Claxton: It is not intended to. I think the hon. member was out of the chamber when I replied to another hon. member's observations. The question here is one of interpreting an existing statute, which is often a difficult matter. In every case brought to my attention I try to see that a fair and proper interpretation is given as justified under the law, yet the most favourable that can be given in favour of the man. It is simply a matter of the interpretation of an existing statute unless we are going to change the whole principle and have the insurance principle apply to service in the reserve and active forces. So far the government has not decided to do that and there is no legislation proposed to be offered at this session in that connection.

Mr. Knowles: I appreciate the point made by the minister that as the law now stands it is a matter of interpretation. He has made that clear to me in the correspondence we have had. My hope was that this sort of case might have led the government to feel that a change was needed in the legislation. I point out that this chap was on full-time service, and I fail to see why there should be need of the introduction of any far-fetched new principle to take care of this sort of thing. I am sorry the legislation is not making this change and I hope this matter will receive further consideration.