

most discouraging when a single member makes speech after speech, day after day. I refer, of course, to the hon. member for Témiscouata. I am reminded of a cartoon I saw recently, which showed a censor busily clipping at a letter with his scissors, taking out whole sentences and paragraphs. He leaned over to his friend and said, "It is not the information contained in this letter; it is the eternal repetition that I cannot stand." I know this house has become exasperated, and I know further that the country is becoming exasperated and getting fed up with our system when one man can monopolize so much of the time of the house. It is hard for me to say this, for I have a great deal of personal respect and admiration for the hon. member, but the time has come when we can no longer listen to one man monopolize the time of the house. Are we sent here by our constituents and given an indemnity to listen to the views of a single person? If we were all to speak as much as the hon. member speaks, then I believe we would have to split into three eight-hour shifts and sit three hundred and sixty-five days a year.

I do not intend to take up all the subjects which have been referred to, but there is one I do want to mention; I refer to certain what I might call hygienic safeguards which are reputed to be issued to the armed forces of Canada. I wonder if my hon. friend has heard of the crusade that is being carried on throughout the world to stamp out one of our greatest curses, venereal disease.

Mr. POULIOT: I rise to a question of privilege and to a point of order, and I will take the point of order first. Yesterday I started to speak about this matter, and the Minister of National Defence said that this was not the time to deal with it, that there was a special item covering the matter. If the hon. member for Leeds is permitted to speak of it now, I do not see why I should not have the right to ask questions on the same item, after he has finished. I should like you to decide that point, Mr. Chairman, for this is my point of order. Later I shall bring up the question of privilege.

The CHAIRMAN: I must repeat that necessarily we have allowed a little latitude, under orders from the committee itself, but I can only plead with hon. members that as far as possible we keep to the item under discussion at the moment.

Mr. FULFORD: I only mentioned that in passing.

There is another point I must mention, though it is of no particular interest to me or,

I believe, to any other hon. member, because I believe the vast majority of hon. members have nothing but the greatest confidence in the Minister of National Defence. Not once but many times the hon. member for Témiscouata has accused the Minister of National Defence of lacking courage. The last time was on May 24, when, as reported, at page 2955 of *Hansard*, the hon. member for Témiscouata said:

What I have said was that the Minister of National Defence did not have the guts to say to the Canadian people that the question was, are you in favour of or against conscription, yes or no?

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that anyone who was decorated three times in the last war; anyone who was wounded three times; anyone who went out to rescue men under fire and was idolized by his own men, does not lack guts.

Mr. BLAIR: The subject under discussion is pay and allowances. I am very glad the previous speaker said what he did. He has saved me a great deal of trouble, because the very things with which he dealt have been worrying me. Perhaps I would have dealt with them in rasher language, in more unparliamentary terms, so that I greatly appreciate his remarks. I regret very much that the minister has to sit here day after day listening to these continual attacks, when he should be at work in his own department. I can understand the minister's fatigue, and that he is tired out. Yet we keep him here, in the chamber. I wonder if, when these speeches are being given, he could not withdraw, and let some minor official sit here, so that the minister could attend to his duties. If we want to retard our war effort, then the way for us to do it, in a sly, deceptive way, is to keep the minister sitting in his seat, and not allow him to attend to his duties as Minister of National Defence.

I do not know how to prevent it, but I do know that if this House of Commons could purchase a mouth gag, or a few things like that, it would be worth while. We need something. I must say that these speeches attacking the Minister of National Defence, and the questions asked, should be withheld as much as possible. And all the trouble is not coming from Quebec, although the biggest part of it is. Toronto spoke up to me just a moment ago. I wish you would talk to some of your own friends from Toronto, and get them to keep quiet. They are what I would call a nuisance. They are embarrassing the minister, holding up the business of the committee and taking advantage of the rules of procedure.