

going on behind the scenes. We must know if these things as set forth in this speech of his are the objective or the goal towards which we are striving. If they are, that declaration should be made on the floor of the House of Commons instead of on a public platform somewhere in Toronto.

We must first declare positively and in no uncertain terms what our objective or goal is with respect to post-war rehabilitation; secondly, having decided upon our objective—and that in my opinion is the main thing—we must formulate plans, and not until then; and thirdly, we should then employ experts to carry out these plans, freed from the fettering influences of bureaucracy. Until this is done, all talk of democracy is idle and futile, and all plans must be relegated to the waste-paper basket where they rightfully belong.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): I wish to ask the minister a question, but I might make an observation with regard to his recent outburst. I think the Minister of Pensions and National Health totally misunderstood the mind of the house, because I am sure there was no wish on the part of members in this corner to find fault with him or to cast aspersions on the conduct of his department with reference to returned men.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): May I make an explanation? I think my hon. friend said yesterday that nothing had been done for two years until 1941. Here I have the complete file of orders in council—a bulky file it is—of the actual attempts made to meet the problem before the time my hon. friend suggests.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Yes, but the really effective work has been done by the minister's department under P.C. 7633—which was not passed until October 1, two years after we entered the war—and subsequent amendments.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): But much was done before then.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): But not the effective work that is being done now. What was done left much to be desired, as the minister must agree. The hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Gillis) said last night what was in the minds of most of us. We have always found the minister not only courteous and prompt in any matters referred to him, but one of the most sympathetic ministers in the cabinet in dealing with returned soldiers' problems. I do not want him to get the wrong impression. But I would say to the minister that when hon. members, whether on the government or on the opposi-

[Mr. Marshall.]

tion side, are trying to present a point of view, it does not help for any of us to get up and blow off steam. Impassioned speeches will not solve this problem.

The minister is not fair when he says hon. members have spoken with complete lack of knowledge of the orders in council. Hon. members who spoke from this corner were perfectly familiar with the orders in council to which the minister referred. What the minister did not understand was that we were pointing out, not that these things had not been taken care of in orders in council, but that the provisions were not in this bill. The minister says that no one in the government said they were. That is true. But what we are contending is that we should have legislation. These orders in council are passed under the annual War Appropriations Act, but they are not permanent legislation. We ought to have permanent legislation covering the whole field, both the immediate situation and the post-war situation. I think on reflection the minister himself will agree with that point of view. What is going to happen if something is not done now to centralize this whole problem is that after the war it will be split up among many different departments, and the average man is going to get what the soldier calls "the run-around". We are getting it to some extent now. We have, for instance, a soldier settlement board under the Minister of Pensions and National Health, vocational training under the Minister of Labour—

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): It is under my control and that of the Minister of Mines and Resources.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): —and something else under the Minister of National War Services. The result is that men often do not know under which department a particular matter comes. I should like to see this whole question of rehabilitation put under the Minister of Pensions and National Health, or under a separate department or commission or some specific body, not scattered over half a dozen departments and so requiring a coordinating committee to hook them up. Every hon. member knows what it means when a particular matter is split up among departments; we run from one branch to another and from one department to another.

I still think that the suggestion made by other hon. members and by myself could be carried out. These measures having to do with rehabilitation should be referred to a committee. Provision is already on the order paper for two committees, one for vocational training and one for soldier settlement. These committees could be lumped