

may happen to him, those who depend upon him will be secure. The man who gives his best deserves that the best shall be done for him.

I commend the minister for this legislation. I judge from what I know of him that no matter what the criticisms may be, or what bumps he may get, he is a man who can "take it" and go along and do better in the future; and I wish him the best kind of success, with the blessing of the Master Workman.

Mr. ANGUS MacINNIS (Vancouver East): I want to say a few words on this bill, although nothing in the way of specific criticism. That does not mean I am at all satisfied that it is what is required at the present time.

The purpose of the bill is the specific one of reinstating in their former employment persons who have served in the armed forces. But, as pointed out in the preamble of the bill, the fundamental reason for introducing it is that it may be part of a scheme to deal with some of the national problems which will confront us when this war is over.

The nature of our problem has been stated or intimated by a number of speakers, and I am not going to spend any great amount of time on it.

I would, however, point out that although the problem will be somewhat like the one we had to face after the last war, and more particularly something like the problem we had to deal with between the years 1929 and 1939, it will in some respects be a different problem, because the psychology of many of the people concerned will be altogether different from anything that has confronted us up to now. Members of this house who have had an opportunity of travelling across the country, from one end to the other, during the last ten years no doubt have some inkling of what that problem will be.

From 1930 to 1939, we had a great many unemployed in the country—I do not think there is anyone in the house more conversant with this than the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell)—and most of them were young men who were living in the most deplorable conditions. As one hon. member has already mentioned, when those young men travelled from one place to another they travelled in boxcars, or some other kind of freight cars. We could see them by hundreds, in dirt and squalor, as we travelled in the ordinary mode of conveyance. But those of us who are travelling across the country to-day see these same young men under altogether different circumstances. They are well dressed and well fed, and when they travel from one place to another they do not ride in boxcars but

in the day coaches, in the standard cars, in tourist cars; and they eat in the dining car like other civilized people. Let me tell the members of this house that these men are not going back to boxcars when the war is over. That is what we have to face. These men to-day are well fed, well clothed and well housed, and they are living dangerously; and I say they will not be satisfied with boxcars, unemployment camps and soup-kitchens after this war is over.

An hon. MEMBER: Why should they?

Mr. MacINNIS: Yes, why should they? That is what the members of this house have to keep in mind in dealing with this matter. If this bill is merely an item in a whole scheme for the building of a new social order after the war is over, then it is all right in its time and place and I have no criticism to offer.

Prior to the commencement of the war, when we were suggesting better treatment for the unemployed, what did we hear? There was no money. Since the war began, I have heard members blaming this little group because the country was not better prepared for the war when it came. They said that we opposed rearmament—as if the government did not have a majority sufficient to do anything they wanted. This group did not prevent parliament from giving a better deal to the unemployed, but the unemployed did not get a better deal. This group did not prevent old age pensioners from getting better pensions, but the old age pensioners are not getting better pensions, though we have always been asking for it.

I believe it was in the first session after the Liberal government came into office that we made certain proposals in the house to deal with the unemployment situation that then confronted us, and the late Hon. Norman Rogers, speaking to the house on the question of unemployment, after making some reference to these proposals made the following statement as reported in *Hansard* of 1936, March 30, page 1593:

I believe it is useless for us to repair the superstructure of our economic life, as represented by our secondary industries, if its foundation as represented by our primary industries is crumbling away. I am not going to speak at length as to what may be done by public employment to meet the economic problem to which I have referred. I may state however that I am quite sure it has been proved by the experience of all countries that public employment of itself is not a solution. I repeat, it is not a solution. It would cost this country somewhere between \$300,000,000 and \$400,000,000 to put at work the employables in the category to which I have just referred.