

or direction of that volume. This tremendous and powerful weapon is still left in the hands of men like these to whom I am referring.

For about seven thousand years our forefathers secured from the earth what sustenance they could by means of their own muscular energy and with the aid of domesticated animals. During that period the tempo of human production hardly changed at all. The only machines in existence were very primitive in nature. Here and there water-wheels supplied a little "direct" power, but that was all. Then man discovered steam, almost accidentally, and instantly the divine spark that is in him burst into flame. Scientific devices increased by multitudes. Great Britain was the first of all nations to adapt her production to mechanized processes. It is only a little over eighty years ago that this great change reached its first harvest. A great many people, and even some hon. members in this chamber, are still unaware of the economic impact of the changes brought about, even in their own short period of life, by the modern process of production of human requirements. By 1851 England's industrial output had reached such a stage that in spite of the fact she was then at the very height of her colonial glory, with vast markets to exploit, under the system then existing and which still exists she was unable to consume within her own borders the vast production of her machines. In order partly to meet this difficulty the first world exhibition was held in London. The world came to England's shore and the world placed orders for goods. England's greatness as a creditor and trading nation grew by leaps and bounds. But the world did something else. It undertook to study England's method and it placed orders, not only for "consumption" goods but for what the economists call "capital" goods, that is, plant, equipment and machinery. I venture to suggest that the year 1851 might well go down in history as the year which saw the transformation of the method of production of the needs of the human race from a non-mechanical to an almost purely mechanical process. From then on it was simply a race between nations to improve the technique of production and we have now reached the stage where such orthodox economists as Sir Arthur Salter and Sir Basil Blackett state that there is no reason why any man, woman or child should suffer a single moment of anxiety regarding food, clothing and housing, and indeed many comforts as well. There are sufficient energy resources to provide the entire population with the adequate necessities and indeed, in

[Mr. E. J. Garland.]

many cases, with many of the comforts. I commend to this parliament the consideration of improvement in economic conditions, so that the spiritual and the cultural may advance. Until we do that we shall never get rid of the degrading conditions in which we find such a large and increasing mass of our people to-day.

Many hon. members around me are manufacturers, and they have had greater opportunities than I to examine the modern technique of production. However, during my various trips throughout this country I have taken the opportunity to visit every factory in any town I might be in. I have seen them weaving woven wire fencing; I have seen them putting heads on nails, something I had wondered about before; I have seen them making chocolates; I have seen them making underwear and spinning cotton on the great looms of Sir Charles Gordon's plant. So on all through the gamut of modern production. Since the introduction of the new form of power known as electricity, of which we know very little other than that we can use it, modern mechanization has been again revolutionized. I have heard of one steel mill which was rebuilt in the spring of 1930. The old mill used to employ some 600 men, but the new mill, which is equipped throughout with semi-automatic electrical machinery, can produce more of a better product and yet gives employment to only six men. Mr. John Davis, formerly Secretary of Labour of the United States of America, pointed out in a pamphlet issued not long ago that the shoe plants of the United States, if working at capacity, could produce the requirements of the country for a whole year in seventeen and a half days. In Canada, we need to realize the potential output of our steel mills in Sydney, in Hamilton and in Sault Ste. Marie. These mills have not for long worked to anything like capacity. The machines of Canada have never been worked to full capacity. The war was the nearest approach to full time use.

The increase of technologic production has been so great that even if the production activity of 1929 were restored, people are estimating future reemployment on the basis of one-half the present unemployed; that is the most that industry can absorb even under the most favourable conditions. I believe that to be a sound contention. I believe that to-day we could produce as much as, if not more than in 1929 and yet absorb only half of those who are now out of work. In addition we have the growing number of young men and women who are leaving our