

came there and opened the victory loan campaign I might have the honour of introducing him, and I will guarantee him a larger audience than he had when he spoke at Lindsay before June 11 last.

With regard to national selective service, they have been short-sighted and inefficient. That is also true of the war labour board. On August 31, 1942, all the operators and lumbermen received a notice to appear at a meeting in my town under penalty if they were not there. Lists of prices and wage schedules that we could pay to men, both loggers and cutters, were laid down. We tried to live up to this as well as we could, but it was inadequate to fill the bill. I told the board so at that time. However, ten months later, after the operators were put out of business so far as cordwood is concerned, we were paying \$3.75 and the war labour board said that we must cut it down to \$3.40. The result was that our men left and disappeared into other work, and our organization was broken up so far as producing wood was concerned. At that time I was producing 500 cords of body hardwood a month, and for the benefit of hon. members from the fishing areas on the coast, a cord of body hardwood is the next thing to anthracite coal.

Ten months later I received another notice to meet in the town of Huntsville in an adjoining riding. At that time they told us to go out into the bush and get out cordwood because there was a crisis at hand, and that we could do it at any price. They said to us: "If you have not the money we will finance you; if you have not the men we will give you internees." Well, the house can realize the position I was put in living in a riding comprising people of English, Irish and Scotch descent with a really first-class bunch of workmen in that area. If I had started to bring in internees I do not think I would be here to-day. However, the policy adopted was short-sighted because the operators who were taking out the cordwood saw the crisis coming in January and February, 1942. The government or the department did not see it until June, 1943.

I should like to say a few words on housing, because it affects us too. To-day housing is being handled by two departments of the government. I think one would be sufficient. They have been fumbling the ball more or less back and forth between the two departments. If they had one improved programme of housing they might go through for a touch-down. We do not need wartime housing. If they gave private enterprise half the chances that they gave wartime housing, private enterprise would build more houses and build them

better and more economically. We have no wartime housing in my riding, but houses are being built by private enterprise, by soldiers who are coming back from overseas and by citizens. Those houses and that programme are being held up at the present time because of the freezing of materials for wartime housing. Wartime housing is not producing materials of construction; it is stealing them from the producers with the help of the government, and the net result is production of a number of houses at public expense in an uneconomic way at the cost of the building of a greater number of houses by private enterprise at private expense. Wartime housing is not making more labour available; it is only adding competition for the scarce supply existing. The performance of labour on government projects is proverbially less efficient than on private projects. The net result of the intrusion of Wartime Housing Limited is to increase the cost of houses. It has been demonstrated that in the temporary house field wartime housing cannot build as economically as private enterprise. The government would be well advised to release some of these controls and let our returning soldiers, and our citizens go ahead and build their houses.

I have a neighbour living across the road from me. He is not a wealthy man but he gathered together a few dollars to build a house. He started that house in the spring; he worked a lot of the time on it after he had his supper; he worked at night and he finally got the house to the position where he could live in it. He had an order in for windows, doors and the like. He moved in after I had lent him a few windows, and after he had patched up some with paper and so forth. Then he received a notice that his order for windows and doors had to be cancelled owing to government control. That is the situation in many cases, and it is certainly wrong so far as private enterprise or anybody who wants to build a house for himself is concerned.

I could go on and talk for quite a while yet and touch on a lot of other matters, but I have had an opportunity of advertising my own riding and an opportunity of inviting all hon. members to come to my riding at any time and I shall close with these few remarks.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Question.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggart): Mr. Speaker, while we are waiting, and before the question is put, I should like to say briefly that we intend to vote against both the subamendment and the amendment—

Mr. MACKENZIE: Good.