

asked for the complete conscription of industry, the Social Credit party has urged that production is one of the very first necessities in connection with our war effort.

Certainly it cannot be said, even by the hon. member who has just taken his seat, that the government is responsible for this all-out war effort, or possibly I should say for this partial war effort. Had it not been for the pressure of public opinion—yes, and even of industry—we certainly never would have achieved the amount of production being carried on to-day. In fact, I do not think the government would wish to take credit for all the development in production. It has become an established fact all across the country that this government will not move until it is forced to do so. Certainly credit should be given where credit is due, and I would be the first to give it, but I think one of the greatest responsibilities upon the shoulders of the government is to see to it that when there is an obstacle in the way of an all-out production job, that obstacle is removed by legislation, and that every possible step should be taken to assist industry and the people to do a greater job than is being done. As the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) have said on many occasions, the only limit to our productive capacity should be the man-power and the raw materials we have in this country.

It was for this reason that we of the Social Credit party advocated an all-out war effort in 1939. At that time we stood alone in our demands, and we had the most severe criticism directed at us. We have not by any manner of means achieved an all-out war effort yet, even in the field of production, to say nothing of agriculture. As I have said already, we are doing well. I have travelled around the country; I know the industries are doing a good job and that the men employed in those industries are just as anxious as they could be to carry on a greater production programme than is the situation at present. Industry is also anxious to increase production, and I would not say that the government were not equally anxious, but what they desire to do and what they actually do are two entirely different things. It largely boils down to this, that as a result of government policy we have not been able to get down to an all-out war effort. I remember that last year I made in this house a statement to which the Prime Minister took very strong exception, even going so far as to attempt to reprimand me and to say that my statement was untrue. Now, after having had a year's experience on the war expenditures committee, after having gone through another year of war and after having travelled across

[Mr. C. E. Johnston.]

the country, I am more than ever convinced that what I said then was true. Therefore I am now going to repeat my statement, that by reason of government policy industry has been compelled to slow up production.

I am not going to dwell further upon that statement, but I have repeated it in order to make myself perfectly clear to the house. I think every hon. gentleman is greatly concerned that we should achieve an all-out war production, and for that reason I think we should have more information. The other day I was pleased to hear the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe) state that the four thousand men at the Angus shops in Montreal, who were expecting to be laid off, were going to be given some other useful work to do. As the minister said, many of these men are trained mechanics, and he said he would see to it that they were kept at work, either in the production of Valentine tanks or in other plants where their services might be required. But while he was making that statement I could not help thinking that I have heard similar statements on previous occasions, so that before I put too much faith in what he said I am going to wait and see the result.

I recall that when I was in Calgary a short time before coming to Ottawa for the present session, there were from 150 to 200 men laid off at the Ogden shops, where they had been making guns. I visited that plant; I was introduced to the superintendent, Mr. J. L. Gubbin, who had been brought there from, I believe, Montreal. He was exceedingly courteous to me and called in one of the plant foremen, whom he asked to show me about. I was shown all through the plant, and I think I saw everything that was to be seen. Here was a factory that had been changed over to make guns; now they were laying off two hundred men, among whom I was told were some of their best mechanics. These men were going to be thrown out of their jobs; as a matter of fact some had already been laid off, and I believe the greater portion have not been given other employment even yet. That was not, by any manner of means, the fault of that plant. The management were exceedingly put out because they were not able to keep these men working. As was pointed out to me, the management had gone to a great deal of expense and trouble in training these men for this particular job, and now that job was to be taken away from them. At that time the management did not even have an order to go ahead with anything else.

That is why I am a little sceptical of the minister's statement the other day, when he said he would see to it that these four thousand men were put to work. Here is an actual