

pletteness as the employees of the inspection board. That is to say, he might make a more general inspection of materials, castings, components, and things of the kind, and—quite properly—leave it to the inspection board employees to do the final inspections. There again it would be appreciated if the name of the plant, without the name of the informant, could be brought to my attention, and I will see that it is dealt with.

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: As regards the minister's comment that it may be a local condition, I have visited several plants in different places where that situation has been brought to my attention.

Mr. RALSTON: About employment, or numbers?

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: Regarding the number of employees. On one occasion the employer of several thousands of factory workers, when I asked him why he did not report that situation, replied that if he were to do so the percentage of rejections in his plant would immediately increase.

Mr. RALSTON: I do not think that is quite fair. The board has no interest of any kind in rejecting material; what it wants to do is to get the material out and to get it to the troops. I know all the board well enough, from General Lock down, to be satisfied that that is their primary consideration.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): There has been dissatisfaction among men and women working in different munitions plants in regard to the inspectors being able to take rest periods during the day, whenever they cared to do it, whereas the workers had to stay on the job. That is the case not only in one place but right across the country.

Mr. RALSTON: I am informed that they do try to conform to the work rules and the hours laid down by the plant itself. I have an idea that I know the plant which my hon. friend is talking about, and I can only surmise that there might be a chance for a lay-off until some piece comes through, and, instead of standing around the machines, they go away and sit down. I realize, of course, that morale might not be particularly enhanced by that action on the part of the inspection staff.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): I should like to have some information with regard to the findings of the inspection board. Has the minister any data on the number of rejections; whether the percentage of rejections tends to increase or decrease; what arrange-

ments are made with the firms manufacturing war materials, and, where those firms are responsible for these rejections, whether they are charged back to the firms or whether they are allowed a certain percentage of rejections and charged anything above that? As the minister no doubt knows, two trials have taken place in the United States in recent months, one three months ago and one now in process, in which two large firms have been charged by the United States government with the production of defective material knowing it to be defective. What has been the experience of the board in Canada with regard to such rejections? Are they increasing or diminishing, and in the event of rejections being on the increase, what steps are taken by the board and the government to see that the firms in question are made to pay for mistakes which are attributable to their own carelessness or negligence? Further, what material has been accepted and later found to be defective or faulty when put into actual use? An answer to this question would show to what extent the work done by the inspection board has been useful.

Mr. RALSTON: As to the percentages of rejections, the committee realizes of course that it depends altogether on the particular piece of equipment under discussion. It depends also on the length of time during which the manufacture has been going on, because the longer a piece of equipment has been in production the more efficient the operation will become. In reference to the question of payment, that is to say as to what is done about rejections, a report is made to the Department of Munitions and Supply and payment depends entirely upon the contract which is made with the particular concern. It may be that they are operating on a cost-plus contract or on a contract which entitles them to a certain allowance on development, or it may be that they are operating on the straight basis of being paid for the actual usable machine which is delivered off the line. I am told that definitely the percentage of rejections is decreasing. I do not know that we should particularly pride ourselves upon that fact, because they ought to be decreasing the longer manufacturing has been going on. My advice is, however, that quality in Canada has not been surpassed in any part of the world, and that goes both for material and for workmanship. Manufacture and industrial experience have been extremely satisfactory compared to other countries, particularly where Canada has taken on such a variety of lines which were entirely new to Canadian industry.