

strong terms and who was asked, "Do you know him?" He said, "Of course I don't know him. I could not talk about him like that if I knew him." I think that applies to many cases.

I should like to add one other word on this discussion of profit. The place where we are worried about it is some place that is quite far off. We see it in connection with some big corporation. But I should like to remind people that profit comes a long way down the scale, so far down that if those who criticize will take the trouble to investigate, they would find that in a great many cases "she ain't there at all." After all, jobs come first, and quite rightly so; with proper and sufficient wages—quite rightly; then taxes. I am not sure that taxes do not come first, but I will leave it to the lawyers to tell you about that; at any rate they are near the top; the experts can fight that out amongst themselves. In the third place, the plant must be taken care of or there will be no taxes or dividends. Fourth and last—and often, as I say, there is no "last" to it—comes profit. I know that there are instances of extravagant profits, but they can be taken care of by the tax collector. The Minister of Finance is pretty good at that.

I have spoken of the individual side of employment. I come now to the state, and I propose to say very little about that. The state, of course, has recognized responsibilities which it never dreamed of recognizing ten years ago. I should like everyone to realize that all of us have learned something in the last ten years. Not only the socialists have been learning; I think the rest of us have learned something too. I am quite willing to admit that we did not know everything in the nineteen-thirties. I heard somebody say, and I must admit that it annoyed me very much, "We can't vote for you; you were wrong in the nineteen thirties." "Well," I said, "why don't you say that we were wrong in the eighteen thirties? Maybe we were." At any rate, I come back to this point, that we have all learned something. The state has learned something, and the state has to take some responsibility. However, it is not so much about that that I wish to speak. I wish to say something about the human element in employment, which, I believe, is terribly important and the neglect of which, in my opinion, is causing some of the troubles we are having to-day. It is giving the Minister of Labour some of his sleepless nights.

What do I mean? I mean that labour is entitled to be talked to seriously and on the level. The other day I was talking to a man

who had a good deal to do with the returning troops, and he said something that interested me greatly. "These fellows in the army," he said, "have been told what the score was. They have never been put into a show and told it was going to be easy and that everything would be perfect. They were told what the difficulties were and what the casualties would be. They were not sent in with the idea that it would be a push-over when they knew very well that it would not be a push-over. And when these fellows come back they want to be treated the same way in civil life and not like a lot of children. They will want to know what the score is, and if things are difficult they want to be told. That is the way to get their cooperation."

May I say with great deference and respect—I regret that he is not here—that in my opinion when the Minister of Reconstruction (Mr. Howe) made his speech the other night he did not make a serious contribution to the discussion. I say that with respect, because I think we can admire, and I have no hesitation in saying that I admire, the courage and energy of the Minister of Reconstruction. But do we not need more than courage and energy in these days? Do we not need some sympathetic understanding and some wisdom?

I would venture to say with all respect as a humble member of the opposition addressing the minister—and I hope I shall show that respect right along; I do not think anyone will doubt that I have always had it: Do not let us have this Pollyannaism, this—I was going to say Couéism, but I am told that word is no longer in vogue. At any rate, I say, do not let us have this indiscriminate optimism, this auto-suggestion. Let us come out and talk to these fellows plainly, and I think they will respond. I would recommend to the minister that he should take an example from the Churchill technique of 1940 and tell these men the difficulties, and not pretend that everything will be lovely, because I think that is where the real progress will come from.

I am bound to say I thought my old friend the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Claxton) went for quite a ride the other day when he told us the wonders of the present administration. So far as I could understand his speech, everything had been foreseen, nothing had been left undone and, there really was not a single thing, which, in retrospect, they would have changed one iota. I understand the Secretary of State (Mr. Martin) did admit—I do not know whether he was off guard or not—that V-J day did catch them a little unprepared. At any rate, I felt in listening to my old friend the Minister of National Health and Welfare that I should have been