

may set one group of men against another group, which would be not only wrong but deplorable and against the public interest. We must see that that does not happen; we must see that we do not divide the people of this country.

In discussing this matter let us keep clearly in mind that at the conclusion of the last war we failed to provide for the returned men, for their rehabilitation, and failed to provide for the men and women who had performed a service to industry. While to-day the men on the battle front take the greatest risks and suffer the greatest dangers and privations, let us not forget that the men who remain here tilling the soil and providing the food, and the men and women who work in the factories engaged in the production of essential munitions and supplies, render a service that is also essential to the winning of the war.

To my mind we are going about this problem in the wrong way. It cannot be tackled piecemeal. We must consider the whole picture, and when we do, we shall find that many more things will have to be done than we have yet dreamed of doing. This war, let me repeat, is in the minds of many of our people not a war in the ordinarily accepted sense of the term. It is a revolution in the best sense of the word. People throughout the world, particularly in the democratic countries, are becoming more and more determined—and this parliament must awaken to a realization of the fact—that we have to formulate a policy which will prevent our people from going back to relief lines. As the hon. member for Lake Centre has said, our young men are not encouraged to enlist voluntarily when they see other men demobilized and going on relief, or even obtaining from the unemployment insurance fund assistance which after all is limited to fifty-two weeks or the number of weeks the man has served in the armed forces. I know from correspondence I have received and the hon. member for Lake Centre says he has received, that the return of men to the relief lines here and there in the country, and, may I add, the treatment of widowed mothers who are unable to get the same provisions that wives get by way of separation allowance, have militated against recruiting.

A bill of this description is insufficient to meet the needs of the situation. We must do something in a bigger way. It is about time that this parliament told the government that we want the ablest committee that can be established to go into the whole problem of present rehabilitation and post-war reconstruction and rehabilitation. If we approach the problem with open minds we may find that we can and must do much more than is provided by this bill.

When I was in England last autumn, as other hon. members of the delegation will remember, we found many committees working on this problem of post-war reconstruction.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Just one.

Mr. COLDWELL: They were not all government committees. The government committee was acting as a sort of clearing house for all other committees established by various organizations all over the country. We have nothing here yet comparable with that.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Yes, we have.

Mr. COLDWELL: We have not the same sort of committees operating to the same extent—not as many and not as representative. We have a committee established by the government, and while it comprises some very fine men it consists substantially of only one type of individual—

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Oh, no.

Mr. COLDWELL: Well, to a large extent.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Organized labour is represented, and industry, and agriculture.

Mr. COLDWELL: One man from labour.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): One out of six.

Mr. MacINNIS: Is that the proportion labour bears to the rest of the dominion?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Would my hon. friend say that Tom Moore is not a good man to represent labour interests?

Mr. MacINNIS: Yes; I have already stated so publicly, but he is only one man in six.

Mr. COLDWELL: Does the same thing apply to agriculture?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Agriculture has one out of six, too.

Mr. COLDWELL: Let me point out to the minister that these representatives of groups or bodies should be chosen by the body or group itself, rather than nominated by the government. If they are going to represent agriculture, let them be chosen by agriculture. If they are going to represent labour, let them be chosen by labour. Then we shall know that they are representative of those groups.

I want to say as clearly as I can that in my opinion this bill, while the principle can be approved, is utterly inadequate even to