

word "conscription" some people understand conscription for overseas only, while others understand conscription for overseas and for the home front, and still others—those who believe that Elliott Little was right—understand by conscription national selective service which has been established in virtue of our mobilization act.

Conscription cannot be one-sided, and the hon. member for Parkdale has been persistent in this matter. We need reinforcements for the army. Undoubtedly the more exposed the army is, the more reinforcements will be asked for. But that is not all. The idea of national selective service is this—and I am the more at ease in speaking of it because many hon. members have indulged in great praise of Mr. Little. The understanding of Mr. Little is that the war effort to be complete should be well balanced; and if it is one-sided, if conscription is only for the army, it will always be one-sided and will never be well balanced.

It is very simple; it is elementary. Many people have played on words and left others under a false impression, and that is why I have asked a question which is quite clear. Indeed, I am much surprised that it was not answered at once yesterday, because, although it seemed lengthy, all the information that was asked for in that question should have been given to each member of parliament at the beginning of each session, in order that we might have been in a position to understand the working of national selective service.

Although I have many friends in the army and some relatives, too, and I try to do the best I can for them while they are there, I have the deep conviction that national selective service is doomed unless all draftees, N.R.M.A. soldiers, whether they have had previous training or not, should be put under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Labour. And unless the Minister of Labour is the big boss of the whole show and is in a position to tell the farmer, the fisherman or the railwayman, and all others in essential industry, "You are called by the army, but you shall not go because you are required where you are now"; if conscription had been explained in that way to the Canadian people there would have been no friction or national disunity; we would have had unity.

The people are not afraid to work; they are willing to work. But they do best in jobs in which they are experienced, and when you take them away from essential war-time jobs, where they are rendering good service to the state, and put them in the army to drill the whole day, they do not give the same service.

[Mr. Pouliot.]

This is the point I make, and I hope the hon. member for Parkdale, who is a leading citizen of this province, will understand our point of view in that regard. I say the same thing to hon. gentlemen on all sides of the house who are not affected by prejudice, who are open-minded enough to consider the best interests of this country. That is why I insist once more to-day that all men who have some practical experience in any essential industry, and who are not needed in a technical capacity in the army, be put under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Labour as a judge to put them wherever they will serve the country the better. Otherwise national selective service would be a farce. Would it be impossible to have useful reinforcements for the army overseas?

With regard to the reinforcements for the army overseas, what is the eighth army? It is made up of Canadians and Hindus. What is the fifth army? It is made up of Canadians and Americans. It is time that the English people brought reinforcements to the Canadian forces who are fighting overseas. I do not want to scandalize anybody, but I ask you, Mr. Chairman, how is it that Canada has to do the whole thing and the other people look from their ivory tower upon us?

Mr. ROWE: That is laughable.

Mr. POULIOT: My hon. friend laughs.

Mr. ROWE: Who would not laugh at that?

Mr. POULIOT: That shows how biased and how prejudiced the hon. member is; how blind he is, and how it is impossible for him to understand matters as they should be understood. I remember what he said about farmers. He said that farmers should be exempted, yes. He has spoken exactly as I have done in a speech he made in this house. He has spoken a lot for the farmers; but when there was a demand to act, shoo, he was voting against the farmer, and the same applies to all hon. members who have declared themselves as true friends of the farmers. The hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe and the others were all for the farmer in words when they were speaking in this committee, just the same as they have been for the farmers before; but when there was a vote on an amendment that I moved along with an hon. friend of mine; when the hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains brought in an amendment supported by another hon. member, and when the hon. member for Gaspé brought in an amendment, they all voted against it. They were all for the plebiscite, all for the mobilization act. They