

And again:

... but the services want to determine what shall be a fair method of rehabilitation and demobilization; to help the men who remain in the service for a considerable time due to military duties, but duties which may not be as pressing as the duties we see before us this year; to help these men to prepare themselves, looking forward to the time when they will be discharged and return to civilian life.

And again, speaking of the men whom he proposes to put in charge of the affairs of the returned men:

... men who will understand the problems, the aspirations, the needs and the ambitions of these boys.

These remarks touch a responsive chord in all hearts of soldiers and soldiers' friends everywhere. The question everyone is asking is, what chance will the soldier have after the war? Will he be able to get a job? Will he be able to live in comfort if there are too few jobs to go around; that is, if he cannot get a job? Will he be able to go into production as farmer, manufacturer, businessman, and sell his product at prices covering cost of production plus enough remuneration to enable him to live and to support a family? The minister has been too vague in his expressions. Soldiers of the last war had plenty of promises—in general. They were to have "homes for heroes", and the like. Soldiers of this war ought to have commitments more specific than those. Let the minister be more specific.

Let me ask him several questions. Let him answer those questions straightforwardly, painstakingly, and precisely, as he has done the numerous other questions already asked of him.

As a plain common man, father of soldiers, and representing fathers, mothers, brothers, sisters, friends and sweethearts of soldiers, I desire to put these questions to the minister and to ask that he shall answer them in this parliament before this debate is finished.

As long as the minister may be charged with ministerial responsibility in this or in succeeding governments, first, will he here and now pledge himself to insist that his colleagues adopt such measures for stimulating and distributing production of Canadian goods and services as will guarantee, first, that every member of the armed forces of Canada shall have a job; or, being denied a job, shall have freedom from want and fear; second, that every returned man or woman, having a job, shall have a stable income, ample to provide for abundant living; third, that every producer shall be able to sell his goods at stable and equitable prices such as will render readily available to that producer prosperity and security with freedom; fourth, that Canada's national income be maintained at not less

than \$8,500,000,000 after the war; fifth, that these desirable results shall be achieved without additional taxes or public debt?

Again, will the minister, for the sake of those who have given their lives and those who now risk their all for freedom, pledge himself to insist that Canada, to the extent found needful to attain the desired objectives I have mentioned, shall use debt-free money, money that can be spent, not lent into circulation, debt-free money by spending which the Canadian government can, first, establish and maintain stable and equitable price and wage structures; second, stimulate production; and, third, provide adequate markets to consume Canadian production?

Will the minister pledge himself to the use of such debt-free money? I maintain that if the minister does not dare or does not feel himself free to rise in his place in this house and answer yes to every one of these questions, then he is not prepared to make good the promises which he implied in the fine passages which I quoted at the beginning of my remarks.

Mr. POULIOT: At six o'clock we were speaking of the mobilization board. It comes under this item because, very often, matters are submitted by the army to the mobilization board which are under the Minister of Labour, and the mobilization board makes a ruling which is asked for by the army, so that the board is used as an army board. Of course, there are cases of recruits sent by the district magistrate to the camp, and their case is not settled by the mobilization board. But if the recruit, the N.R.M.A. soldier, puts his application before the board for a postponement and the board declines it, he then goes to the camp and asks his commanding officer for leave, and the commanding officer may say, "We will refer the matter to the board," so that the board is the appeal court with respect to its own decisions. That is not sense.

I have received letters from headquarters in which it is stated that if farmers and lumbermen are denied leave from the army it is because the mobilization board has refused to give it. I would prefer the decision to be made by the commanding officer and the matter not submitted to the board only *pro forma* when the army is not bound to follow the recommendation of the board, as it was before. It is only a farce. It is better for the army to take its own responsibility, and then the matter would be divided between two classes of recruits, those who have already been doing some training in the camp, and those who had no training.

That being said, I come to conscription as it is understood by different people. By the