

Mr. GILLIS: Because the Department of Pensions and National Health have made a start on it. They have set up a committee. They have set out certain regulations. If that department were handling the whole problem, it could be considered as a whole. But if the problem is to be divided up, by juggling it from one department to another, we shall wind up with accomplishing nothing, and with no one accepting responsibility.

As far as my experience in the house is concerned, the Department of Labour is the only department of government which is not enforcing the legislation it is supposed to enforce. As a worker I am badly disappointed with that department. Outside the house I have always indicated that department specifically as the one to which the worker may turn when in difficulties. But my experience in the house has been that the name of the department should be changed. It might to-day properly be called the employers' protective association. I say that because in that department there is legislation which directly applies to the difficulties which the workers have been getting into from time to time. It is very clear and plain to me that that legislation could be enforced by the department, if they were so inclined. But they seem to take the reverse stand, and it is the employer they are concerned about at all times. I need not elaborate upon that point. It has been demonstrated time and again—Windsor to-day; Kirkland Lake last week. It has been that way right along for the past two and a half years.

I had the pleasure of serving on a parliamentary committee on pensions and national health, and I listened to the discussion with respect to rehabilitation. I heard the minister speak. A report was presented by that committee, which dealt with the rehabilitation of the man who comes back from service. I believe that committee made the best start that could be made when it tabled its supplementary report in the house on Friday, June 13, 1941. That committee was representative of all political parties in this house, and its membership was made up almost entirely of ex-service men. It dealt specifically with the question of rehabilitation which we are discussing under this bill, and recommended:

That consideration be given to the retaining in the service for a period not exceeding six months after the date on which they would otherwise be discharged, non-pensionable and non-disability members of the forces with no assurance of immediate post-discharge employment, with the object of enabling such members of the forces to obtain employment and to be reestablished in civil life.

If this bill contained something of that kind, it would be a start in establishing a new order

[Mr. Gillis.]

of society. It is rather disillusioning and it lowers the prestige of those in this house who attempt to speak for the people when phrases like "the old order of things", "the new order of society that must come forth", "the new ideals and new concepts" and so on are used. We have heard phrases such as these from all sides since the outbreak of the war. But each and every time those in authority should bring forward something by way of legislation that would lead us to believe that they were sincere in making these pronouncements or in giving this lip-service, or that they believed in a new deal after this war is over, they come back with exactly the same old story.

No consideration is given in this bill to the man who did not have a job. This is simply legislation to maintain the *status quo*. A man without a job is prepared to lay down his life for the institutions of this country. The committee on rehabilitation in Great Britain have recommended that the man who fights this war, who comes through Singapore, Hong Kong and the other battles that will have to be fought before this war is over, is not to come back to the ranks of the unemployed. The Department of Pensions and National Health have made a start. A man is entitled to \$9 a week if he is single and \$13, if married. That is a start, but it is still relief. At the expiry of the relief term there is no guarantee of a job.

Eighteen months after the war is over, public sentiment begins to cool off. People begin to forget that a man has fought. The men who came back from the last war had to take off their buttons in order to get jobs, and it was not very long before they had to do that. Ex-service men were considered as tramps and bums, and they were called that by many influential people. We do not want a repetition of that. We must make a start toward bringing in a new order of society. We must have this on paper by way of legislation. We must demonstrate to the people that we are not merely talking about this matter in order to fool them.

There are many sections of this bill to which I can give my own meaning. For example, section 2 can be used as a lever for conscription. The trainee is excluded. A man who is on a job and is called up for training, if he does not volunteer for overseas service he can be ruled out when he comes back from training. There is no protection for him in this bill as far as his job is concerned.

Mr. MITCHELL: I should like to point out that the trainee is protected under the regulations.