

meet the situation which it pretends to meet. I believe we should urge upon the ministers who are here this afternoon and upon the government on every possible occasion—and I am taking this opportunity now—that from the membership of this House of Commons we should appoint the ablest committee we can select in order to formulate plans for the care of the men who return from overseas or who come from the armed forces in Canada; for the care of those who are incapacitated in industry and are no longer able to serve in that field, for they are serving, too; and that we should make plans now for the post-war situation. Surely that is our responsibility. If we fail to make adequate plans, I dread to think what the conditions will be when this war ends.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Just before the minister speaks I should like to say something, and I believe the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Reid) has something to say. I rise not for the purpose of discussing further the principle of this bill, but to give my earnest support to the suggestion that has been offered by the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker) and the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggart (Mr. Coldwell). I believe this bill and all the subjects related thereto; the proposed bill with respect to land settlement, which is a rehabilitation measure; the vocational training bill, which is a rehabilitation measure, and all kindred subjects should be submitted to the best committee, to use the words of the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggart, that this house can select. Let them make a study of it. Then we shall get away from the charge of having piecemeal legislation. It will be much more than a gesture; it will show the country that the House of Commons, with the government backing it, is getting down to a real study of a problem which is bound to raise its head more and more as the war goes on and men are sent back to this country from the various armed forces. I earnestly beseech the two ministers who are guiding this measure that they withdraw this bill at the moment and have the cabinet give consideration to this suggestion over the weekend. They will get the support of every group in this house and every body of public opinion if they show that they want to meet this problem now in a wholehearted manner and try to cover the whole field, as far as it can be foreseen. That is the suggestion I make to the minister, that he withdraw this bill and send this whole question to a committee.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): There seems to be among hon. members of this house a tremendous misconception about [Mr. Coldwell.]

this bill. It was never intended to be a major part or portion of the reconstruction programme. It was introduced, only at the specific request of the leader of the opposition himself, to implement an order in council which has been in effect since June, 1941. Many persons have already found employment under the provisions of the order in council. Surely no one thinks for a second that this bill could be considered as a major portion of the reestablishment provisions. It is only very, very limited in its scope. But I must correct certain observations which have been made by various hon. gentlemen. I was very much disappointed yesterday to hear the remarks of the hon. member for Weyburn (Mr. Douglas) and the hon. member for Trinity (Mr. Roebuck), both of whom displayed a complete lack of knowledge of the terms of the order in council passed by this government on October 1, 1941.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): They are not in this bill.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): They were not intended to be in this bill; but I want to tell my hon. friend that if he studies the specific benefits conferred under that order in council, he will find that in our legislation we have gone further than any other part of the British empire or any of the allied nations in our attempt to help those serving their country in the armed forces. Instead of displaying a complete lack of knowledge of the order in council, which I personally directed to them by mail for their information in case they should miss seeing it in the *Canada Gazette*; instead of paying so much attention to some flaws—for there will always be flaws and deficiencies in pensions and reestablishment legislation—they should have some pride in what this country has done in regard to the men serving it to-day. I met the reconstruction committees in England, as did the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggart; I told them what we had done in Canada in regard to reconstruction and reestablishment proposals, and they all told me we were more advanced in Canada than they were in England or in any other part of the empire.

Look at the provisions of the order in council of October 1. Look at the provisions with regard to education; for assisting a man who is awaiting the return from his enterprise on the farm; for vocational training; for putting men back on a parity with those in insured employment; for looking after men by way of out-of-work compensation; for free medical treatment for one year. I say, and I will not hesitate to say it to those who are competent to discern, that in this dominion