

Mr. MACDONALD (*Brantford*): I might add that that man had steady employment before the war, and there is no doubt in the world that if that man had not offered his services to his country he would not have been returning to camp on that night and he would not have been killed. I think in that case his death was attributable in any event to the fact that he had enlisted. I am not suggesting at this time an amendment to the Act, but it does occur to me that the Act could be widened to some extent so that instead of saying "directly attributable to the war" words could be added such as "arising out of" or "in connection with military service". That would widen the scope of the Act considerably.

There is only one more thing I should like to say in closing and that is that I feel the citizens of Canada at this time are prepared to give every consideration to the men who are enlisting and offering their lives for the defence of this country. I feel that the people of Canada are not satisfied with the order in council as it is now drawn, and I think that this committee would do well in recommending a wider clause to the Act so that men who are serving their country and who suffer injury, or are killed in service connected with their duty, may come under the Act. I hope the Act can be amended or widened in that way.

Mr. McLEAN (*Simcoe East*): Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that there may be very good arguments advanced to the effect that all people who are serving the country in war time, either as civil servants in all these various departments, and even those who are serving the country indirectly in growing the food to feed the people of the country and building the machines and all that sort of thing, should be insured by the state. It seems to me that the argument that a soldier outside of a theatre of war should be insured applies in very much the same way to every other civil servant. As an illustration, take something that happens at one of these camps. Here is a man who is driving a truck hauling lumber into Camp Borden. Here is another man who is, say, doing administrative work. They both take sick. If the man in uniform is ill due to his service he is pensionable. But if something happens that has nothing whatever to do with his service, what is the difference between the man who is driving the truck without a uniform and the man who is driving the truck with a war service corp badge on his uniform? I do differ most emphatically with those who say that there should be no distinction between the man who fights in battle and the man who stays here in Canada. I do not think the people of Canada will ever agree to giving no special consideration to the man who risks his life and fights in battle. There is no comparison between the man who for a month, six months, a year, two years, four years, is risking his life every day and the man who is not. I am not disparaging the work the latter is doing, but there are thousands of men who know perfectly well that they will never risk their lives.

Just take what happens here in Ottawa. I am not criticizing it, though it was criticized in the house the other day; I suppose it is the natural thing. Here are civil servants. We do not insure our civil servants. But it is found expedient in connection with the administration of the service to take civil servants and put uniforms on them, give them rank and give them high rank. Just because it is expedient to take them out of the civil service and put uniforms on them and give them ranks, does that give them some special right to insurance by the state? I cannot see that at all, Mr. Chairman. I certainly think that there ought to be a distinction between the men who go to fight in battle and the men who stay in Canada.

Let us keep this fact in mind, about which there seems to be some misapprehension on the part of some members. If a man who is a member of the forces here in Canada—even though he never expects to go out of Canada—is, in the performance of his duties injured or killed, he is pensioned. Let there be