

hon. member for Parry Sound, if he will allow me to say so. I am trying to get from the minister the merits, to put it baldly, of government expenditures as opposed to private enterprise.

Mr. SLAGHT: What has that to do with this bill?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Of course that interjection is of a kind with the last one.

Mr. SLAGHT: It is a question if I am permitted to ask it.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): It has quite a lot to do with this bill, and I shall try to make it clear. This bill primarily is based on two theories. First, there is the duty of private enterprise and the theory that that is the best way by which these men can be rehabilitated. What I want to get from the minister is his views as to how we can best rehabilitate these men, through what agencies that can be done, whether part government and part private or whether all private. I want to know if he thinks the encouragement of private enterprise would provide the avenue through which employment might be obtained for these men.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): With all due respect to my hon. friend, I hardly think that his question deals with this bill. His question has to do with economic policy, and I suggest to my hon. friend, with the utmost deference, that any government in power must work with the economic system in existence until that system is changed. The purpose of this bill is to give the government the opportunity to avail itself of the resources of free enterprise until that might be changed by the free opinion of the people. Surely, to ask the minister whether a system of free enterprise or a system of socialism would be the best to get results is not germane either to the principle or to any particular section of this bill. I might say quite frankly that as far as I am concerned I think the duty of any government is to use to the utmost all the resources of free enterprise by cooperation with free enterprise.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That is partly an answer to my question. I do not think the minister objects to answering the question. I invite him to give us his opinion.

Mr. MITCHELL: It is quite a large question.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I know it is, and I think the minister has some ideas.

Mr. MITCHELL: I have a lot of ideas, but most of them are predicated upon whether or not we win the war, and I say that with all sincerity.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I am not taking it otherwise.

Mr. MITCHELL: I do not think it is a fair question to ask on a bill of this description.

The CHAIRMAN: I would point out that it is out of order. We are in committee, and under standing order 58 we must study the bill clause by clause. The question put by the leader of the opposition is beyond the scope of the bill and is clearly out of order.

Mr. COLDWELL: I have not said anything on this bill. I was going to comment on the question asked by the leader of the opposition, but since, Mr. Chairman, you have ruled on it as you have, I do not propose to deal with that except to say in one brief sentence that if we are going to discuss the implication of the bill within our economic structure, I want to make a speech. But this is not the place to do that. In my opinion the people are expecting us to get along with the business of this house with more rapidity than we have shown in the past month or five weeks.

Mr. MARTIN: You should have supported me when I objected to the hon. member for Weyburn (Mr. Douglas).

Mr. COLDWELL: The hon. member for Weyburn was not called to order by the Chair or anyone else; the Speaker ruled that he was in order. I think we might get the minister to explain what he proposes to do when this bill is passed. Who is to be responsible for its enforcement?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That is covered by the last section.

Mr. COLDWELL: I am quite aware that it is, but there is no indication in the bill as to who will be charged with that responsibility. I think the bill was properly described this afternoon by the hon. member for Trinity (Mr. Roebuck) and by the hon. member for Weyburn as a gesture. There was nothing improper in characterizing it in that way because the minister himself indicated that this was but a beginning, as it were, and in that respect it might be termed a gesture. The bill is to provide for the reinstatement in civil employment of individuals who enlist for service in his majesty's forces or who perform essential war employment.