

I certainly think the hon. member for Lake Centre and the hon. member for York-Sunbury have proven in this house in the last few days that inequality does exist in the call-up between different sections of the country. The hon. member for York-Sunbury this afternoon told of a farmer in his locality with four sons who were granted postponement, or at all events they were not in the service, while a neighbouring farmer had his only son in the army. I could cite similar examples from my province. The examples I have given are not from my constituency. I know of a farmer who was not beyond an age at which he could continue to work his farm, who had four sons, grown up young men, and a younger son not of military age, who before the war were running less than a rented section, but since the war some of the boys have bought more land by agreement of sale and are continuing to stay on the farm. One can readily understand the feeling that exists in that community when they see that and then see a neighbouring farmer without a son left to help him on a much larger farm, and the older man forced to operate the farm alone. That is not a healthy situation; it is most unhealthy, but these are some of the results of the man-power policy of this government of to-day. As was stated by the hon. member for York-Sunbury this afternoon, the operation of a few of these mobilization boards under the Department of National War Services has been little short of a disgrace. My sympathies are very much with the Minister of Labour and his staff because, after almost four years of operation, the man-power situation has become so tangled that it is almost impossible for any human being to unscramble the man-power muddle we have in Canada. The minister and his department deserve sympathy in attempting to make something of the bad muddle we have at the present time.

Mr. GILLIS: I wish to say a few words on selective service and how it operates. The real test of any machinery is the way in which it functions and the service it performs. Before I go into that, I should like to pay my respects to the hon. member for York-Sunbury. I am sorry he is not in his place at the moment. Generally, after making one of his orations to the house; after making a left-handed swipe at the members of this group, he packs his grip and goes away for a rest, to get some more wind up. This afternoon he referred to bill No. 80 of last year, to amend the National Resources Mobilization Act, and the attitude of members of this group on that bill, and on the stand of members of this

group who were in the house at the time war was declared. I did not happen to be in the house at that time, but I followed very closely the position taken by the members of this group, and I would say this with respect to bill No. 80: While we do not agree with the government's handling of man-power for military purposes, the Prime Minister, when he explained the government's position with respect to bill No. 80 of last year and the future of man-power for military purposes in this country, left no doubt in the minds of any member of the house as to his intentions. He clearly stated that there would be no change with respect to the raising of men for military purposes until he returned to this house and asked for a vote of confidence. At that time the hon. member for York-Sunbury and every member of his group voted for and supported the Prime Minister and the government with respect to raising men on that basis for military purposes, and incidentally at the same time made the remark, after the vote was taken, that the government had looped the loop three times within twenty-four hours on that particular question—and he looped the loop with them. His speech yesterday afternoon clearly indicates that he is now endeavouring to get hold of a parachute to ease himself to the ground in order to alibi his way out and apologize for the stand taken at that time. I cannot see where he can do anything in the future, on the basis of that vote cast for bill No. 80 of last year, except to support the government all the way in any policy they may bring before this house. The members of this group did not do so. We realized at that time that it was placing too much power in the hands of the Prime Minister on that question to support him in that measure, and left ourselves free to fight and analyse the proposals and take whatever action we think necessary on that question when it comes before the house. We insisted at that time on that vote that a bill should be brought before this house for the purpose of raising men for military purposes which we could vote on, and with regard to which we could clearly understand what the regulations were. The hon. member for York-Sunbury did not do that, and he has absolutely no criticism to make, or should not have, because the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation members kept both hands free and intend to fight that issue when it is brought before the house at some time in the future.

With respect to the attitude of this group in 1939, I think any hon. member who is conscious of Canada's position at that time would take exactly the same position. He could not take any other. The generation