

Health was not very clear to me, particularly his reference to part I and part II of the act. I should like to have this made clear: when these two new departments, that of veterans' affairs and that of social welfare, are finally constituted, will there still be the Department of Pensions and National Health?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): No. But this particular measure deals only with part I of the act of 1928 which is entitled, "An Act respecting the Department of Pensions and National Health." Part I confines itself to peculiarly soldier problems; and Part II may be merged in any social welfare legislation which may subsequently be brought down in this house. Therefore, unless the two bills would be enacted concurrently it might be necessary to enact this present measure by proclamation. So that the part of the pensions and national health measure dealing with national health would remain as such unless the house were ready to deal with social welfare legislation at the same time as we deal with and assent to this legislation.

The department will deal, as I said, with pensions, demobilization, medical care, vocational guidance and training, the rehabilitation of our men in civil life, the War Veterans' Allowance Act, and allowances to non-pensioned widows, and will also take over the Veterans' Land Act, the Soldier Settlement Act and such other measures as may be referred to it from time to time, the idea being that all measures affecting generally the welfare and rehabilitation into civil life of the members of our forces will be embraced within the ambit of the measure which will follow upon the resolution which is now before the committee. I believe that if hon. members will compare the sections of the new bill with the sections of part I of the Department of Pensions and National Health Act they will find that many sections are the same. Some have been modified to a slight extent, and some have been completely recast as a result of the changes which have taken place since 1928.

That is, as succinctly as I can make it, an explanation of the structure of the legislation; and I hope that, just as all the veterans' organizations through Canada have endorsed the principle of this bill, every hon. member will give it his support.

Mr. REID: I rather gathered from the minister's remarks that the old Soldier Settlement Act will be included in the provisions of the new bill, and that the Veterans' Land Act will remain under the minister.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): I beg pardon; evidently I did not make myself clear. Both these land settlement bills will be under the minister of veterans' affairs.

Mr. GRAYDON: I have no desire to enter to-night upon a lengthy discussion of soldier re-establishment or rehabilitation, because an opportunity to do so will be presented on other occasions, particularly when the second reading of the bill takes place, and during the committee stage. There are, however, one or two matters of sufficient importance to be raised at this preliminary stage.

I was interested in the minister's explanation of the manner in which two departments will replace the present Department of Pensions and National Health. Under the wording of the resolution it was not clear to me that this did include the Pension act and the present Department of Pensions and National Health, although I recognize that the term used, namely re-establishment of members and former members of the armed forces, may cover it in a general way. I was about to raise objection, were two departments to be added to the present departmental set-up.

During the debate which was concluded just before the dinner recess to-day, it appeared that the resolution which forms a basis for a new department provides that it shall take the place of a department which would normally pass out of existence with the war, the reconstruction department then taking its place. I look with some jealousy upon increases in departments such as might be envisaged by changes of this kind. We now have nineteen cabinet ministers if we include, besides the Prime Minister, the leader of the Senate, and also seven parliamentary assistants. We are now to lose one department, although, to judge from the interest which the present Minister of Pensions and National Health takes in this legislation, and the pleased way in which, in collaboration with the Prime Minister, he helped to introduce the measure, it would not appear that we are likely to lose the minister, at least until the appeal to the people comes. In any event we are adding another department to the government, and so continuing to encroach markedly upon the private membership of the government forces. I presume that this process meets with considerable approval on the government benches, but from the point of view of economy and general organization so far as the ministry is concerned, I regard this as a good time to caution the government not to set up too many departments. Some holders of existing portfolios cannot be said to be overworked. Indeed, there is not enough work for them to do; their jobs could be doubled up. I say that plainly and frankly, without making any reflection upon any minister. It comes down to this, that there should be a reorganization of the cabinet to take care of this situation properly. I raised the question once before, because we have