

accept help, or charity, from the municipalities. No one desires to impose upon any discharged soldier the necessity of accepting charity. Many of the boys were discharged with a lower medical category than they had at the time they enlisted, and so were unable to resume their former occupation. I fear that many more will fall into that category, and under the relevant section of the bill they will be excluded from the benefits of the measure. To give one instance, a lawyer might argue that if a man when he left employment was in category A, to get his position back he would have to be in the same category. I believe there are few who will contend that it is possible for any man who serves in the armed forces and goes through a period of many months or perhaps some years of actual fighting, to be in category A when he returns to his civil occupation.

No doubt, after the war is over, extensive public works will be carried on by both the dominion and the various provincial governments. I wonder whether the minister has any plan whereby some commission or board will be set up on which the different provinces will be represented so that in the undertaking of all these various public works, on which large sums of money will be expended, some preference or special consideration will be given to soldiers who do not come within the benefits of the bill we are now considering.

I have a further suggestion to make to the minister. After the bill is passed, his department should prepare a small book or pamphlet giving an explanation of the measure, the various benefits it confers, and so on, and a copy of that should be given to each soldier at the time he obtains his discharge certificate.

I should like to make one further suggestion somewhat along the lines discussed by the hon. member for Weyburn. When the house goes into committee of the whole it would be well for the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell) and the Minister of Pensions and National Health (Mr. Mackenzie) to give a general statement as to precisely what has been accomplished to date in the reestablishment of the many thousands of soldiers already discharged, how their present plans have worked out, and what further plans or schemes the government may have in mind to take care of the thousands of soldiers who will not come within the benefits of this measure. I am sure that if they would consider that suggestion and make such a statement, it would greatly assist in dealing with the bill in committee of the whole.

Mr. G. J. McILRAITH (Ottawa West): This bill is one of the measures being taken by the government for the rehabilitation of the service men now in our active forces and is something for which the government is to be commended. There are, however, two matters connected with the whole problem to which I desire to refer briefly. One has been mentioned this afternoon; it relates to the provisions made through the Department of Pensions and National Health: The rehabilitation grant of thirty days' pay and allowances for those having served not less than six months in the forces, which is to be found in P.C. 7521; the order granting free medical treatment to all those who served, for twelve months after discharge, which will be found in P.C. 2763; the establishment of a welfare division of the Department of Pensions and National Health; and the post-discharge reestablishment order, which will be found in P.C. 7633.

For some reason or another these provisions have received very little publicity, though they go much further than is generally thought. It would be useful if they could be brought before this house by the minister in such a way as to permit a full discussion of the whole subject matter of the rehabilitation of our men in the armed forces; and not only that, but in such a way as to place on the record a systematic indication of what steps have already been taken in that regard.

The second matter to which I desire to make very brief reference arises out of the remarks and the line of argument taken yesterday by my good friend the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Church). As I followed his argument, he took the position that he was for protection; and by protection he seemed to refer to tariff protection as applied prior to the outbreak of this war. He argued that protection would have to be the backbone of this bill; that if protection was not the backbone of the bill, it would fail and would have nothing to support it. He went on to develop that argument by pointing out that we are now making agreements with other countries which will practically establish free trade and so injure businesses which might qualify under this measure. Then he went back to urge a return to the old days of protection. He went a step further in his argument and, referring to the Atlantic charter, declared that that document would interfere with and, indeed, kill the present bill. His reason for that was that the Atlantic charter proposes the abolition of tariffs on the south and north American continents. He referred specifically to two paragraphs of the Atlantic charter,