

### After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. POULIOT: Mr. Chairman, I have only a few words to say in connection with the answers given this afternoon by the minister. Some time ago I asked for some information about the English expert who had been brought here, and he answered my question by referring to Mr. Greber who designed the plaza, Mr. Gunn being an Englishman and Mr. Greber a Frenchman. That is not the point at all, and to say that Mr. Greber is a Frenchman is no answer. We may bring in an expert from outside the country who has had experience in the development and beautification of cities; but when it comes to trade and national conditions, when it comes to choosing a man who must make suggestions or decisions on such matters, it is essential that we have someone who really knows the conditions that prevail. Conditions in England or the United States are different from what they are here. England is a small country with a large population; Canada is a large country with a small population, and the United States is a large country with a large population. How can a man from outside the country decide that an industry should do this or do that, decide that laundries are not essential and so on?

There is good material here among our people who possess common sense without bringing in an expert from some other country. This was supposed to be kept secret. Some of the members of the press gallery called on the department and were told in secret that Mr. Gunn had come to make these adjustments. I think the minister should rely upon people who live here. I do not say that in a parochial sense; I say it because I believe that a man who has spent his life in Canada, who has been in touch with business and industry, would know more about this country than an outsider who might spend a few months here and then make suggestions which amount almost to decisions. It is no answer to quote what was done in an entirely different field. I am not prejudiced or biased. If a Frenchman with a Parisian accent had been called in instead of Mr. Gunn, I would have criticized that action just the same. What I am complaining about is that this man has been appointed over the heads of good Canadians who could have done this job much better.

I should like to congratulate the former leader of the opposition upon many of the things he said this afternoon, but there are two or three sentences to which I must take exception. This reminds me of Doctor

Edwards, the head of the Orangemen, who finally wrote me a letter in French. I nearly converted him. I do not contend that I have converted the former leader of the opposition, but he is making some progress. How long it will take, heaven knows. He stated one fact which deserves widest publicity. I took notes when he was speaking and I hope I can quote him correctly. He said that when the Prime Minister was endeavouring to get gentlemen from outside the pale of the Liberal party to enter his government after May, 1940, he approached various gentlemen who were adherents of the Conservative party and offered one of them this job of Minister of National War Services. Are we to have union government? Then the hon. member for York-Sunbury went on to say that to his everlasting credit the gentleman spurned the offer, because he was not going to do the dirty work of the administration. He went on to say that that is true, that that is a matter of history.

I never thought the Prime Minister had done that, although it was stated in the press. It is a surprise to me, and I hope the Prime Minister will make a statement when he has an opportunity to do so to-morrow. If we are to be the Liberal party we do not need anyone from the Conservative party as cabinet ministers. That is my humble view. I have been fighting against national government and union government ever since the last war, and I do not intend to change my views in consideration of anyone.

Then the hon. gentleman went on to ask: Is the ministry being maintained for the purpose of political expediency, to find a place for the present minister who was put into office for the ostensible purpose of converting his compatriots to the principle of conscription for military service overseas? I do not agree with the hon. member when he says that the Hon. Mr. Justice Thorson was a wash-out. That is not the language we would expect to hear from the lips of a gentleman of the legal experience and ability of the hon. member for York-Sunbury. We would not expect to hear him call the senior judge of the exchequer court a wash-out, comparing him to a shower. That is not worthy of the hon. member, and I am sure it was a slip of the tongue. What he said about the Minister of National War Services being appointed in order to convert the people of Quebec to the idea of conscription has been referred to by Miss Judith R. Robinson in the press, the *Toronto News*, and so far it has not been denied. If that is the case, then I think some questions that it would be proper to place on the order paper would be: What are the dates on and places at which