

C273137

1776

COMMONS

because of departmental red tape and lack of organization, and they recommended that the dollar-a-year men should be given an opportunity to dissociate themselves from the industries from which they had been loaned. It was pointed out that in the United States there were 255 dollar-a-year men and 631 who worked without compensation. That committee, composed of business men, came to the conclusion that dollar-a-year men from industry, however patriotic and desirous to serve they might be, might be considered still to have the business point of view of the organizations to which they originally belonged. It showed that comparing the war effort of the United States now to the last war effort was aimless and purposeless. I believe the fact to be that the expenditure of \$22 to-day gets the same results as the expenditure of \$1 in the great war.

There was one piece of information which I do not think has ever been given to this parliament. I will ask the minister to tell me whether it is true that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation of the United States advanced \$50,000,000 to the aluminium industry in Canada in order to permit of the development of that industry here, repayment of the amount to be made as deliveries occur. That is what the *United States News* of December 5, 1941 says—that there was that advance given the Canadian aluminium industry in order to build up the necessary industry in this dominion.

It was found, too, that as late as January, 1942, 75 per cent of the industry of the United States was still producing civilian needs, 50 per cent in Great Britain and 40 per cent in Germany. The committee pointed out that there was only one way in which there could be a reduction in civilian demand and that was for the government to act promptly and ruthlessly and place in charge a man who had power to act regardless of any influences or any consideration.

I have already suggested that we should set up a committee with powers similar to those of the United States committee, not for the purpose of criticizing the government—I think the government is too prone to think that every suggestion from this side of the house is made from political motives, but to help in the war effort. I offer that suggestion to the government, but I say this: Do not set up a committee like the war expenditures committee which is overloaded with government members. Give the opposition equality. Set up a committee reasonably equal, the chairman and vice-chairman from the government, to assure a majority, and let the proceedings be in the open. As far as the war expenditures committee is concerned, while I

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

was not here all summer, I know of the results achieved. We sat on that committee and everyone was desirous of doing something; but measured in actual performance, if honestly admitted, we did little or nothing—and I am rather overstating the case when I say "little". The committee met behind closed doors. The information that was given to us should, I submit, be known to the people of Canada. There was no question of production or of details of that kind. If you want to ensure honest production on the part of all in production in Canada, you must have them realize—certainly some of them—that what they do is subject to investigation by parliament, or subject to being brought to the light of day.

When that committee is set up again—and I am speaking only for myself—I would say if it is going into details in regard to contracts, it should be open to the public, so that the information shall become public, for what information we did get is hidden and concealed. Such a committee could do a great deal of work. It cannot perform an impossible task. There are those who say that if we set up that committee we should be able to investigate all contracts. My answer is that no private member of the house knows what contracts have been awarded since August; but we do know that if the committee dealt only with current contracts that were being awarded when we were sitting, 1,500 a week, we would have been able to devote only eight seconds to each contract—and there were eighteen or nineteen lawyers out of twenty-three members of the committee. I need say no more as to the possibility of investigating all contracts.

I pass on to one other matter before I conclude, and will make a passing reference to the orders in council that were tabled yesterday regarding man-power. It should be noted that what opposition members have been saying for the last year is now admitted by the government, in the very first paragraph of P.C. 2250:

Whereas the Minister of National War Services and the Acting Minister of Labour report that there is a growing scarcity of men available for service in His Majesty's armed forces and for the employment in the war industries. . . .

All that these orders in council do is to set up a scheme for service in Canada, far removed from the sanguine hopes expressed by the Minister of National Defence for Air (Mr. Power) or by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell) in the advance statements that both of them made. Why was the raising of the age limit stopped at thirty? With the threat by the Japanese to the Aleutian

C 273138

MARCH 25, 1942

1777

islands, only seven hundred miles from their nearest naval base, why the thirty-year age limit when there is an admitted shortage of men to-day?

I suggest that the men who have already been called up and medically examined and rejected should be rechecked. I realize that there may be some cases where advantage was taken by a prospective recruit of the opportunity of the examination by the physician of his choice—they were very few in number—who granted a lower category than the person properly belonged in. I mention Saskatchewan in that connection, and according to a member of the board there, there were three rechecks, and in one it was found that out of nineteen turned down seven, on recheck, passed as A-1.

The whole foundation of these orders in council seems to be based on what has been found insufficient in the United States, namely that only the age limits should be chosen in which men could be expected to continue in military service for ten years. The United States started off in that way, taking only the highest physical class, and those who normally could be expected to continue in service for ten years. But to-day it has been found necessary to extend the age limits. If we are to have men in Canada for Canadian defence, why not train more than those of ages up to thirty? Even all of them are not subject to call, because the choice is going to be made by lot. It strikes me as passing strange that, facing the spring offensive of 1942, the government is not able to tell us what scheme it has for choosing the men who will be taken into the non-active force. In the rehabilitation of those men who have been turned down, the government is taking a step in the right direction, but that rehabilitation should cover not only those who might be made A-1 by slight operations and the like, but also those other men of B, C or D categories who might be used in Canada for home defence.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Yesterday as the house was debating the resolution to appoint a committee to deal with matters of reconstruction and reestablishment that may arise at the close of the present war, I debated in my own mind whether or not, for a reason that seemed to me a most important one, I should intervene in that discussion. I did not intervene because I was anxious to see the committee appointed; I was also anxious that no one should have reason to feel I was in any way unsympathetic with the purpose for which it was being appointed. I doubt if too much thought and study can be given to questions of reconstruction as they are likely to arise at the

close of the war. But in thinking the matter over I have since regretted that I did not say a word at the time, because of a possible false emphasis that might be given in the public mind from the discussion which took place in the house and from the fact that the resolution was presented from the government side of the house. It is just conceivable that a large part of the public, reading that the House of Commons has appointed a committee to deal with post-war reconstruction, may gather the impression that the government has in its possession information which would lead it to assume that the war may terminate at an early date and that we should be prepared immediately to deal with questions of reconstruction.

One of the reasons why I rise to-day is to say that I would wish emphatically to dispel any possible impression of that kind. One does not like to dwell unduly upon the seriousness of the existing situation, or unnecessarily to alarm the country; but I think it is only right that the people of Canada should understand that at no time since the commencement of the war was the international situation as serious for the free countries of the world at it is at present. Far from seeing ahead a moment at which it may be expected that the war will terminate, I must confess that I am unable to see any time that could be specifically mentioned, and that it would be little short of a miracle if the war were to terminate within what some would describe as a short time. One has only to face the facts as they are known and try to realize their significance to see what a tremendous and terrible course this world will have to run before anything in the nature of reconstruction of an order even such as existed in the past is going to be possible for any country or any group of countries to undertake.

When the war started there was a Europe composed of free nations. To-day the whole of Europe practically has ceased to be free and lies prostrate at the feet of the conqueror, whose country occupies a large part of central Europe. There was at the commencement of this war a great French empire; to-day there is no France that can call itself its own, and the French empire, as such, has virtually disappeared. So far as it exists, it exists in large part to carry out the wishes of Germany in different parts of the world.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): And yet we have the Vichy ambassador here.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Well, I will give my friend an answer in regard to that later. When the war commenced, all the strategy of the war was planned on the understanding and belief that the close alliance

45-1942-2