

thirty thousand men would be used in the Pacific theatre of war with proportionate number of men from other services. Therefore, so far as the people of Canada and the members of the forces were concerned the major operation of the war was ended on V-E day. If that is the case then my leader was justified in finding fault with what the government has done, not so much in what they perhaps have said they are going to do, but rather in what they have actually done.

I come from a riding which has equalled any other in so far as enlistment of men and contribution to the war effort are concerned; and I hear complaints all the time. The men who feel they are entitled to come back are kept there on the ground that they are needed, that they are key-men. That can be said of any man. I suppose every man above the rank of private could be called a key-man. Even a private might have some qualifications that would enable them to keep him there against his desire. There is a great feeling of discontent on the part of these men over there and their families at home. A great deal of criticism is made of the demobilization scheme so far as it affects the man overseas.

I listened to the answer that was given by the Minister of Defence (Mr. Abbott) to the question as to university students. At that time I did not know I was going to speak to-night. I did not have enough nerve, or ability to get up and ask about one phase of the question which I believe will be rectified now when I bring it to the attention of the minister. When it was stated that university men could be discharged in order to go to the university there was a rider attached to it that they must have the consent of the university to accept them. Remember it was about August 27—it might be a day or two before—that this order was promulgated. Yet most universities demand that all applications be in by September 1. I was interested in a couple of boys who were able to get into university this fall. One father told me that it was only by accident that his boy got in. I believe he was in that famous city of Hamilton, where he happened to see the commanding officer and some other official whose consent was necessary. Because of this fortunate circumstance his son was able to get into university, but he told me that his boy had received some previous university training, and that if he had been given more time, instead of getting the boy in the first year he would have been able to get him in the second year.

[Mr. McMaster.]

This is not a political question. It is important to the youth of our country; it vitally affects those who wish to go to university, those who will become our leading citizens, become members of parliament and occupy other leading positions. Something should be done to see that every boy in the forces who desires a university education is given an opportunity to acquire it. There is also the question of the boys overseas who have had perhaps one year or two years in university. I happened to come in contact with one father while looking for another boy. I found that his son, who had a year or two in university, was still overseas. When I spoke to him about seeing what could be done in regard to getting the boy home he gave me this answer, which I think is important and probably represents the opinions of many others. He said, "My boy does not want any preferred treatment; he does not want to come back before his turn." That may be true. I do not know whether university education is more important to one of these boys than a job may be to someone else, but certainly I believe these boys should receive every consideration, and that boys desiring other special instruction in other walks of life should receive similar consideration. I have been told, and I believe it to be true, that there is in operation overseas what is called a khaki college; but how can such a college provide all the courses that will be required? One boy may desire to complete a course in political science; he may have been in his second year when he entered the service. I do not see how that boy could complete his course except by going to some institution other than the khaki college, which with all due respect, I do not think can operate with one hundred per cent efficiency, and which I am told covers only a course of the first year or two at college.

Then I do not understand why a boy should not be allowed to go on and complete his secondary school education. He has to be eighteen before he can enter the army, or seventeen if he enters with the consent of his parents. Surely secondary school education is essential in connection with a great many occupations and professions, and these boys are entitled to it. In Ontario the law demands that a boy go to school until he is sixteen, whether or not he is learning anything and whether or not he desires any further education. Surely when this matter is called to the attention of the government, as I am bringing it to their attention now, they

will make a special effort to see that the boys who require secondary school education are given an opportunity to acquire it.

During the course of his remarks the Prime Minister said he believed in short speeches. I believe in them also, for a very personal reason, because I could not make a long speech if I tried. So I will follow his advice in at least one respect, but I should like to mention one other matter about which I feel quite strongly, for reasons I need not go into to-night; that is, the work of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell). Something occurred in these parliament buildings to-day about which I am not particularly proud. I need not say more about that, except to say that I believe it was a direct result of the sort of thing I am now going to mention. Sometimes I go to picture shows. My wife likes to go, and so do I. Sometimes I see something instructive relating to current events. The only way I ever saw the late President Roosevelt was on the screen, and occasionally I have seen other celebrities in the same way. One thing I disliked was that while the pictures of celebrities were shown they were not shown for long enough. You saw them for a minute and they were gone, though you felt that you would like to see them for a little longer and perhaps visit with them for a while, even if only on the screen. On one occasion I attended one of the theatres in High Park, where they have good family theatres. There I saw something which rather disturbed me. It was just about at the time of the by-election in Welland. I did not agree with the stand of the government in that by-election; I thought they were going the wrong way in governing this country during those strenuous days and, as I mentioned earlier in my remarks, I thought there should be ways of getting better men into the government. On this particular evening we saw on the screen a gentleman making an eloquent speech; I wish I could make one like it. His audience was a number of men working in the war plants of Hamilton. This was not a picture which just ran across the screen and vanished; it must have lasted five or six minutes, and it showed the men in the audience all wrapped up in what was being said by the speaker, who was the Minister of Labour. He said to them, "You are doing great work in this country. Your work is just as important, yes and more important, than the work of the soldier in battle." I thought to myself that if in that audience there was a father with a son overseas he should write his son to come back, to give up the \$1.10 a day and get a good job in Hamilton and be really patriotic. Perhaps, however, that

father's idea of patriotism would differ from that of the Minister of Labour. I do not blame the minister for going over to Hamilton and trying to build up the morale of the workmen by telling them they were wonderful boys. It might help them and would not harm anybody else; but I could not understand why that particular picture should be shown on the screen before an audience in which there must have been the wives, fathers and children of soldiers. That was all wrong, and now we see the result of that sort of thing. "As ye sow, so shall ye also reap."

I said I intended to speak for only a short time. I am only one of some sixty-six members in this party, one of whom has already spoken. I think I have said about one-sixty-fifth of what could be said in this debate. I am not greedy; I believe in leaving something for the other fellow to say, so that I will resume my seat.

M. ÉLIE-O. BERTRAND (Prescott): Monsieur l'Orateur, à la fin des hostilités, après six années de guerre, je désire que mes premières paroles dans ce Parlement soient pour remercier la divine Providence d'avoir protégé les armées des nations alliées et de nous avoir donné la victoire sur nos ennemis. Il appartient maintenant à chaque individu et à chaque nation de contribuer au triomphe du bien contre les forces du mal. Puisse cela s'accomplir et puisse la charité chrétienne donner au monde une paix réellement durable.

Monsieur l'Orateur, je tiens à vous féliciter chaleureusement de votre nomination à la présidence de cette Chambre. La position que vous occupez vous fait honneur et fait honneur à vos compatriotes. Nous nous réjouissons qu'elle soit allée échoir en aussi bonnes mains.

Mr. Speaker, it was most pleasant on Friday last to hear the speeches of the mover and the seconder of the address in reply to the speech from the throne. In his maiden speech the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River (Mr. Benidickson) acquitted himself well, and upon his effort I congratulate him most sincerely. When he stood in his place in the house one could recognize at once the firm hand of the wing commander.

Then, the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Langlois), spoke well in his sea-going fashion. We could picture the Canada he served and loved when serving as a lieutenant in the R.C.N.V.R., and also the Canada he envisages for the future. We are pleased to welcome this nation-builder to our midst.

Speaking of nation-builders may I point out that, as its leader, the Liberal party has the greatest nation-builder Canada has ever