

Mr. MARTIN: I have in mind a similar case. I suggest that this situation be corrected at once. Suppose the man's friends disappeared; later on he would find it difficult to establish his case.

Item agreed to.

Health branch.

480. Health branch administration—further amount required, \$12,398.

Mr. MacNICOL: I am thinking of something which I am sure the minister has in mind too, and that is how we can take care of cripples and generally incapacitated people, those who are disfigured and thereby rendered largely unemployable. They cannot possibly obtain any position. I know quite a number of such people and I am sure that the minister and every hon. member does, but now they cannot get pension until they reach the age of seventy. I have one case in mind. From a child this man has been incapacitated from the hips down, and has to be helped around in a hand-wagon by his brothers and sisters. He is nearly sixty years of age. This applies to persons of all ages, but I am referring particularly to those who are getting up in years. This man is wholly crippled. Is there no pension relief for such people?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): I do not think there is under federal jurisdiction, but perhaps there is some form of assistance under the provincial authorities. As regards returned soldiers, we are responsible.

Mr. MacNICOL: These are civilians. I would appeal to the minister to consider this matter seriously between now and next session. I wish he would give some thought to the problem of cripples and deformed and incapacitated men and women.

Item agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR

100. Departmental administration, \$166,231.

Mr. GILLIS: In view of the fact that the house is about to adjourn and it may be five or six months before we meet again, I believe that someone should say something about a department of government that I consider the most important department, in view of our war situation. I think the Minister of Labour has graver responsibilities than any other minister, and perhaps has one of the most difficult jobs. He is largely responsible for the organization and administration not only of the national selective service machinery, but to a large extent the

[Mr. Ian Mackenzie.]

price control regulations, the freezing of wages, by virtue of his chairmanship of the national labour board.

As a worker I consider that there are many things being done now with respect to labour that are creating much grief for those responsible for the administration of that department. The minister is probably doing the best he can with the machinery at his disposal. I know through contact with the officers and through correspondence that his men are very capable and hard working. The few remarks I am about to make are not for the purpose of condemning or seeking to find fault, but to express my opinion as to necessary changes in the machinery in order to give those charged with administration a better opportunity to do the job they are trying to do.

First I wish to call the minister's attention to the new order in council P.C. 5963, passed on July 14, which replaces order in council P.C. 8253, which replaced order in council P.C. 7440. It keeps you guessing to know where you are, these things are changed so often. We are in a mess of paper up to our knees, no one having much understanding of what is necessary to keep in touch with the regulations.

What is causing most of the trouble is the policy of freezing wages. In the first place it is not necessary. Secondly, I do not think it can be done successfully and at the same time maintain maximum production. This order in council usurps practically every power that the legitimate trade unions of the country should have. It is lengthy; it definitely fixes the cost-of-living bonus. As I said a few nights ago, a large percentage of the workers of Canada, particularly those engaged in non-essential industries, have suffered a reduction in the standard of living to the extent of 15.2 per cent over and above what any other classification of workers in Canada has suffered. This order in council in its general terms solidifies that condition. Under this order I do not think it is possible for those who did not come under the original arrangement of October 1941 to have any adjustment of that grievance. Moreover, under this order in council, if any infraction is committed by employer or employee, the initiation of action rests with the aggrieved person. If this order in council is to be operative the government should accept the responsibility of prosecuting and imposing the penalties prescribed upon those committing infractions. This provision on page 9, clause 3 of the section on offences and penalties, definitely sets out that in the case