

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am answering it; my hon. friend is getting an answer. I repeat what I said, that the only limiting factor on supplies or men going to Britain to-day is the ships available to take them. My hon. friend is seeking to raise a commotion in this country over the man-power difficulties which would undoubtedly be apparent in any movement of people here and there as I have described already, but is neglecting altogether what the commander in chief of the Canadian army says is the position to-day in Great Britain. I say that we owe a duty to the people of Canada, we owe a duty to the united nations to see that Canada's war effort is presented in the true light of its accomplishments and not in the light of some domestic struggle we may be having in regard to man-power.

Speaking of man-power, may I say that I was a bit surprised at my hon. friend, the new leader, this afternoon when it seemed to me he was seeking to embarrass the government in its war effort by directing a veiled attack at the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell). My hon. friend said that there was a need for change in Canada's labour policy and rather sought to add what he could to the efforts that have been made to stir up added difficulties for the Minister of Labour. May I say, to begin with, that no member ever came into a government in Canada with higher encomiums from all sides than did the present Minister of Labour. These were pronounced by men in all parts of this dominion. If one will look at the press of this country, he will see what was said about the appointment of Mr. Mitchell as Minister of Labour and will find that I am perfectly within the mark when I say that there was but one note and that of praise from one end of Canada to the other. That note of praise was given in equal measure by persons of all classes. It was given by hon. gentlemen opposite, in sparing measure it is true, and it was given by the labour men of this country.

When I was seeking to obtain a minister who I believed would be the best minister that I could get to head the Department of Labour, I offered the portfolio of Minister of Labour to Mr. Tom Moore, president of the Trades and Labour Congress. Mr. Moore told me at that time that he was ready to do anything in his power to assist the government, but he did not think his strength was such that he would be justified in taking on a portfolio in the administration. More than that, he reminded me of something I had said to him years ago to the effect that at

the time of the last war Mr. Samuel Gompers in the United States had played an even larger role in the way of assistance to the government by remaining at the head of his organization than he would have been able to play had he been a member of the administration. Mr. Moore told me that he believed he could assist the government in a more effective way if he remained outside. But he said to me, "You cannot get a better man than Humphrey Mitchell." It was on Mr. Moore's recommendation and on what had been said by members of other labour organizations throughout this country, because of the regard in which Mr. Mitchell was held as a labour man and as a former labour member in this parliament that I asked him to accept the portfolio of Minister of Labour and believed that I was securing the best man that could be found in Canada for that position.

Why has there been an attack upon Mr. Mitchell such as has been made in different parts of the country? It has been due, above all else, to the simple fact that Mr. Mitchell has tried to uphold the government's policy of wage stabilization and price control. I want to put this very clearly to this parliament because it is a question we shall have to face through the whole of this session. The government will have to be supported in its wage stabilization and price control policy if we are to control inflation in this country. If that support is not forthcoming and we have to change that policy, then whoever is responsible for that change of policy will have to be responsible for the consequences if they lead to a complete breakdown in price control and to inflation in our country at this time of war.

This is a very difficult policy to maintain; nothing in the nature of restriction is easy in a time of war. I have been repeating that over and over again. There are restrictions that we shall all have to put up with, and if we are going to control prices there has also to be a stabilization of wages. I am not saying for one minute that any stabilization of wages which is unjust or unfair should be maintained. I would be the first to resist anything of the kind and demand that injustices should be remedied. But I do say that no class in the country has as much to lose through inflation as the working classes. I think they will be the first to admit it.

May I point out that this parliament has already approved that policy. Last session we did not have an attack upon our wage stabilization and price-ceiling policy. Members generally conceded that this country was