

those of the chancellor of Queens, in all probability he would soon cease to be Principal Wallace. All one has to do is to consider what happened in another great university in Canada within the last ten years. But we will leave that aside. If the minister is going to play fair with the people of Canada with respect to this committee; if he is going to play fair with the millions of young people who are rising in this country; if he is going to maintain respect for himself and his committee, he must bring in men with new vision, men who are ready to try something new. I shall reserve what else I have to say for a later occasion.

Mr. BOUCHER: I should like to refer to two aspects of this bill. The bill is predicated upon the employer having a duty to take back his employee, and that limits its scope. It might be enlarged if it were predicated upon the industry or the enterprise.

Mr. MITCHELL: What section is the hon. gentleman talking about?

Mr. BOUCHER: I was referring particularly to section 2.

Mr. MITCHELL: Why not discuss that when we get to the section?

Mr. BOUCHER: What I have to say really refers to the whole bill. The onus is on the employer to take back his employee, and there is only one possible employer whom the bill will affect—the one who is not nobly doing his part by the returned soldier, and whose attitude is abhorrent to the Canadian people. Taking in as it does the body corporate or politic, the bill refers to kinds of enterprises, but only so far as the management of the business is concerned, not the business itself. Reference should be made in the bill to the actual enterprise or business which the man left to enter the armed forces, so that it will be the duty of that enterprise, as best it can, to take the man back into employment, even though the personnel governing the enterprise may have changed.

With respect to enforcement, the type of case that will come up for prosecution under this enactment will be that of an employer who does not show the right spirit in the matter of assistance and support for the returned soldier, and fails to do his duty as a Canadian citizen, thus compelling the soldier to have recourse to the courts. A measure of this kind should be administered by the government along the lines of the fair wage legislation. In every large community at least the government should appoint a man who would investigate these cases and institute prosecutions. It should not be left to the

individual soldier to do so, at his own expense, and perhaps to his own ignominy. The returned soldier should not have to hale his employer into court at his own cost. The government should go a lot farther in that regard. I trust that these two points will be taken into consideration in enlarging the scope of the bill for the very purpose for which it has been introduced.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): By order in council the Department of Pensions and National Health has always taken the responsibility of bringing prosecutions where prosecution was necessary. The onus was not on the individual in any case.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: I think sufficient has been said on this bill to let those who are responsible for it know that there is something very seriously wrong with it. We agree with it in principle, but the objection is that the bill does not carry out the principle which is professed in the preamble. The bill is not progressive enough. It places the onus upon industry to provide work for the returning men, and industry will not provide work unless there is profit. Industry as it is organized in this country has failed to do so in the past. We are not forgetting that there were over one million unemployed in Canada and over a million on relief at a time when industry should have been employed in providing goods and services which were needed, and in the production of which man-power was essential. But industry is not concerned about the welfare of humanity.

Mr. MacNICOL: That is altogether an unrighteous statement.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Humanity and industry are inseparable.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Industry and humanity, I say, are very separable. Industry was not much concerned about the unemployed that we had in Canada for a period of ten years.

Mr. MacNICOL: The hon. member does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Is that so? I have seen men go without work and our people in need of food, clothing and shelter, when industry would not turn its wheels, and when industry should have been operating to provide those needs if it had any interest in the welfare of the people. That old set-up has failed. Industry refuses to operate unless there are profits.

Mr. PURDY: What did my hon. friend do for industry?

[Mr. Blackmore.]