

Mr. Bennett: Per annum?

Mr. Rogers: Yes, per annum. It is conceivable that this country might pursue a policy of that kind this year and the year after, but it is not conceivable that this or any other country could continue a policy of that kind without adopting with all its implications the philosophy of socialism.

I direct the attention of the house to that statement. It would cost \$300,000,000 or \$400,000,000, Mr. Rogers said, to put into effect—what? A wealth creating programme such as we were suggesting, the building of houses and schools, the building of hospitals, the building of roads. We could not stand that, we were told. But in 1940, I believe, the war expenditures of the country were \$800,000,000—I am not quite sure of the figures. In 1941 we passed a bill for \$1,300,000,000, and that was not all. This year we have before us an appropriation bill for \$2,000,000,000. But is anyone talking about the country going bankrupt? No; what we are afraid of is that when the time comes for demobilization, when we are not spending billions of dollars on destruction, we shall have to spend a little bit of money to create more wealth, and we are afraid that we shall not be able to stand it and that a terrible calamity will overtake us. Surely we must be crazy. This war must have taught us that if once we can get it finished, we are ready to say that never again need the people of this country face unemployment, poverty, misery or want, because we have everything here necessary to satisfy all our needs. We are proving that every day of our lives now.

I should like to make a suggestion to the minister. But first I would say I am glad, as is the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. McIvor) that there is at the present time a member of the cabinet who at least should understand labour.

Mr. MITCHELL: Does, not should.

Mr. MacINNIS: All right; we will watch you on that—who at least should understand labour. Until he came into the cabinet there was not a man in it who had any understanding of the labour problem either from experience or from study or from any other source. That fact is certainly reflected in the labour policies which have been followed in this country ever since the war began.

What I was going to say to the minister is that if he will get his colleagues in the cabinet to bring proposals before this house, be they ever so progressive, or radical if you like, this house will give them support, because this house is more progressive than the cabinet. I would not be surprised if the country is more progressive than the house. My hon. friend's position in the cabinet may be some-

[Mr. MacInnis.]

thing like that of President Roosevelt and congress; although not having the same power, the minister is perhaps in a better position for getting his measures accepted as far as this house goes than President Roosevelt is in relation to congress, because congress is far less progressive than the president is. The president had great difficulty in getting congress to accept his new deal policies, as great difficulty in convincing them in that regard as he had in convincing them where their duty and interest lay during the last two years. The minister need not, therefore, be afraid, so far as this house is concerned, to bring before it any measure of social reform or social security.

The hon. member for Trinity (Mr. Roebuck), speaking this afternoon—and I think his speech must have been better than I thought at the time it was, because of the criticism it has received—referred to the problems that will confront us when the war is over. He said they would be such as to make the stoutest heart quail. I believe he would agree with this, that they could make us quail only if we insist on adhering to old ideas and outworn institutions; but that if we are prepared to look forward, to take advantage of the knowledge and experience we have gained concerning production since the war began, there is nothing, so far as the problems of production are concerned, and surely there is nothing so far as the problem of organization is concerned, that we cannot easily handle.

I wish to make one other point, not in regard to legislation that may be brought before this house but in regard to its administration. We must be very careful not to pit the returned men against those who did not go to war, as was done on so many occasions after the last war, when the returned men were made pawns of in order to support the selfish ends of vested interests. This must not happen again. I am satisfied that it will not happen again, because the returned men to-day and the men who will return from this war will be wiser than the men who returned from the last war and will not be so easily hoodwinked.

With these few words I shall leave the bill until it reaches the committee stage. I accept it as an almost infinitesimal part of the measures that will be required to meet successfully the problems with which we are and shall be confronted until we learn how to deal with them.

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): I have very few remarks to make on this bill. It has been variously characterized by hon. members who have