

and investment houses. I suggest, however, that he failed to make out a case against the adequacy of the facilities of the existing lending agencies, which is a subject matter I think this house might very well explore. All you have to do is look at the monthly statements of the chartered banks to understand what an immense amount of money is at present available for the extension of business if the opportunity offers.

The last observation I desire to make for the purpose of directing attention to matters which should be studied in connection with this bill—because I think it should be approached from the point of view of what is in the best interests of the country, and having in view the future of Canada—is that it is alleged that it holds out a hope for small industries. Having regard to the attitude of the Bank of Canada in days gone by, and the mentality and policies behind that bank, I am afraid there is not much hope in this bill for small industry.

I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

#### WAR APPROPRIATION BILL

##### PROVISION FOR GRANTING TO HIS MAJESTY AIR FOR NATIONAL DEFENCE AND SECURITY

The house resumed from Tuesday, February 29, consideration in committee of a resolution to grant to His Majesty certain sums of money for the carrying out of measures consequent upon the existence of a state of war—Mr. Ilsley—Mr. Bradette in the chair.

##### DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE FOR AIR

Hon. C. G. POWER (Minister of National Defence for Air): Mr. Chairman, when I addressed the committee on Tuesday I had completed a portion of my remarks but had not given all the information to which I think hon. members are entitled. I had given a review of the operations of the Royal Canadian Air Force during the past year. I should like now to take some of the time of the committee to develop our plans for the future, and, following a custom which seems to have met with favour, to give an account of what might be described as headaches which confront us in dealing with matters intimately connected with the Royal Canadian Air Force.

I propose to deal to-day with the questions of repatriation and demobilization, and, without entering upon the sphere of rehabilitation—which I hope to show is not within the jurisdiction of the defence departments—to give some idea of the plans and blueprints

we have in mind, while at the same time explaining to the committee some of the difficulties we must make up our minds to meet. If I may, I would ask hon. members to consider these difficulties and blueprints and to criticize them as freely as they may desire. I shall welcome any criticism, however destructive it may be to the ideas I set forth.

Let us define the terms I purpose using. First, repatriation: To my mind repatriation means bringing a man back to his home, either from overseas or from some other point in Canada, and putting him in the location from which he enlisted, or where he desires to be. That in itself constitutes a serious problem, and, as I shall presently show, one which is particularly serious for the R.C.A.F.

The next term is demobilization. Taken broadly I suppose that term would mean the dispersing of the armed forces into their civilian components or constituents. But actually it means more than that. It means more than the disbanding of the units. It involves personal demobilization; and that is particularly true in Canada, where, as I have often pointed out, our men before joining the forces were in civilian life, and in the vast majority of instances they will return to civilian life.

On top of this comes the problem of pre-demobilization education, which on a former occasion was explained to the house by my colleague the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston). When we use that term we are referring to such education and training as we can give members of the armed forces while they are still under our jurisdiction, and before they are discharged into civilian life.

Finally comes rehabilitation, the problem of putting the former civilian who has served as a soldier back into a position where he may take his part in the civilian life of our country.

These are the problems with which we have to deal, and, following what was said by my colleague the Minister of National Defence, I propose immediately to state that the last named, rehabilitation, is not a matter which should be undertaken by the armed services or by the departments which look after the armed services. These are matters which have been discussed before. They were considered after the last war by various committees and by the house. I refer back to the pension committee of 1917. I have not the names of all the members who served on that committee, but among them were such men as Hon. Doctor Beland, Lord Bennett and Hon. Charles Marcell, outstanding men of that day, each of whom had to do with first framing the policy dealing with returning soldiers.