

made. Our sons are conscripted and fighting on European battlefields, and now you have the courage to tell me that if any other party were to gain power, things would be worse. My answer is: they cannot be worse. Furthermore, if I have been misled by the Conservatives, I have been equally misled by the Liberals; and, having no confidence in the C.C.F. party, there is only one choice left. I must have representatives in the House of Commons who will not be tied up by party machinery or political partisanship, who will really represent my interests rather than be the tools of a political party.

In view of what I have just said and in order to give a chance to the Liberal government, particularly the Prime Minister and the hon. member for Westmount, to be believed by the population of the province of Quebec, I ask them to take, before the next election, a definite stand by voting for the following amendment. I move, seconded by the hon. member for Témiscouata (Mr. Pouliot), that all the words after the word "that" in the present motion be deleted and substituted by the following words:

this house is of the opinion that no money should be spent for the enforcement of the National Resources Mobilization Act, as well as order in council 8891, and that the above act chapter 13, IV, Geo. VI. and also the above order in council be repealed at once.

Mr. JEAN-FRANÇOIS POULIOT (Témiscouata): I have just a word to add to what has been said. This motion is clear; it speaks for itself. It is not at all in opposition to the bill. It simply gives a direction to the government, which is a committee of the house, in regard to the spending of money; and that direction comes from parliament. The meaning of this amendment is that no money shall be spent for conscription after the statements made by the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of National Defence, and by other leading members of the government. I support this amendment on account of the statement made by the Prime Minister on the first day of March over the radio, when he used this one sentence at the end of the second paragraph:

The reinforcement pools overseas are more than amply filled to meet the needs anticipated by the field commanders.

This is the statement of the Prime Minister, and I am sure he does not speak through his high hat, as some of his colleagues do. He must be well informed, well acquainted with the war situation, and he could not make such a statement without being sure of his facts.

Taking it for granted that the Prime Minister informed himself before making that

[Mr. Dorion.]

statement, and taking it for granted that the Prime Minister's statement is correct, I can do nothing but support the amendment of the hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay (Mr. Dorion). That is the only reason. I base my support upon the Prime Minister's statement, and I do not want anyone to say that we are opposed to the war effort. We are not opposed to the bill, but we members of parliament think members of the government need a secondary direction from parliament.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Question.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does anyone wish to speak on the amendment? I am of the opinion that the amendment is in order. Therefore the question is that bill No. 3, for granting to His Majesty aid for national defence and security, be read a second time, to which the hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay has moved that—

All the words after the word "that" in the present motion be deleted and substituted by the following words: "this house is of the opinion that no money should be spent for the enforcement of the National Resources Mobilization Act, as well as order in council 8891, and that the above act, chapter 13, IV, Geo. VI, and also the above order in council be repealed at once.

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE: (Minister of Veterans' Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I am not sure whether I am in order, but I wish to point out that if this amendment carries it means that the whole war effort of Canada is retarded and impaired. Under the circumstances it is a most serious amendment to contemplate.

I understand Your Honour has ruled it to be in order, but with all respect and deference to Your Honour's ruling, I have some doubts that it is in order. However, in view of your ruling, I have nothing further to say.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am willing to hear your argument regarding it.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): I humbly submit to Your Honour that the amendment to the motion, one which is for the voting of supply to carry on the war effort of Canada, where the amendment has reference to the National Resources Mobilization Act, or any other activity, and where it imposes a limitation upon the message received from His Excellency the Governor General by this house, is not in order. It would be limiting and impairing, and making really impossible the purpose of parliament, which is, I think, more or less unanimous in prosecuting the war to its conclusion.