

majesty's forces. In my opinion it is simply a gesture, but I think it is a gesture in the right direction.

Mr. SLAGHT: You are getting into bad company.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I want to get into company that will get us along farther than we have so far with this bill. I agree with the bill in principle, but in my opinion it does not go far enough to protect the ex-service person or the employee. We must remember that those who join the armed forces to-day give up a great deal of their natural freedom. They must adjust themselves to a different mode of life under army discipline. They are away from their families and must do without many of the things which we enjoy. In many instances they do this for a greatly decreased remuneration. These people offer their all in defence of the worthwhile things of this life that we enjoy and, therefore, they are entitled to every consideration by the government of the day.

I think it has been recognized by authorities that those who served in the actual theatre of war from 1914 to 1918 have had their life span decreased on the average by at least ten years. Many of those people were not physically or probably mentally fit in some instances for reemployment, and they are entitled to consideration by the state. There has been some discussion about the statement made this afternoon by the hon. member for Weyburn. I feel, and I think the legion itself feels, that the manner in which some of those men have been discharged from the army of to-day is nothing short of disgraceful. To discharge those people with one month's pay and a small clothing allowance, to put them and their families on municipal relief, is not good enough for a nation such as this.

Ex-service people who have rendered a special national service should not have to become a municipal charge. As I have said already, those people have offered their all in defence of this country and they should not become a public charge. They should be taken care of by the state. Like the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Leader) who spoke the other day, I am of opinion that those men should not give up their uniforms until they are assured of reemployment or some satisfactory future security. I am sure that none of us looks forward with any degree of enjoyment to the readjustment period, but during this period the government should undertake the development of our natural resources in a big way. Certain public works should be undertaken, and financial assistance should be given to municipalities for the construction, development or improve-

ment of worth-while community projects. The extension of power sites, increased electrification, the construction of public highways and buildings, water conservation projects, reforestation projects, the construction of recreational grounds and other matters should be carried out. These undertakings would be quite beneficial and bring about a betterment in the lives of these communities. These people must be taken care of in connection with employment.

I think we all realize that great social problems will have to be faced in the future by the government and the state. Reference has been made to certain sections of this bill. Section 4 places the onus upon the employee of instituting action if his employer does not want to take him back. Many employees will not take this action because they will fear that if they do so they will prejudice their chances of future employment somewhere else. In my opinion tribunals should be set up to handle these cases. Section 5 deals with prosecutions, and here again the onus is placed upon the employee. I think these sections are improper. The onus should not be placed upon the man who is trying to regain his former position.

In my opinion a committee of this house should be set up to study the matter of the rehabilitation of ex-service men and women in the broadest possible manner. That should be done immediately. Representatives of agriculture, industry, and other callings in Canada could give information to the committee.

Mr. DANIEL McIVOR (Fort William): Mr. Speaker, I must say that when I looked at this bill I was pleased indeed. First, I should like to congratulate the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell) upon assuming his present position. I think he is in the right place. I remember the night when news was coming into this house from the recent by-elections, and I felt quite happy over the results for several reasons. First, I knew that the Minister of Labour understands labour, which is an absolutely essential characteristic of any Minister of Labour who hopes to do his work properly. I speak from experience. When we were in difficulty at the head of the lakes during the years of the depression, the late Hon. Norman Rogers did his best to formulate a youth training scheme. His assistant, the present Minister of Labour, was sent to the head of the lakes, and from the way in which he conducted himself at that time I knew that he would be kind and decent, that he had some backbone which a cabinet minister certainly needs when someone tries to put over on him something which is not on the square.