

department is alive to the necessity of more doctors for national service, but I do not suggest that we need more lawyers or architects or engineers or preachers. I do not know whether I should include other professions, but we certainly do not need any more lawyers in this country.

To sum up, it is represented that because of some of the anomalies to which I have referred in the present regulations, and certain deficiencies in the rules, inequality of service results, and that acts as a deterrent to enlistment in the three fighting forces. I call upon the minister at this time of grave national emergency and necessity to remove all existing anomalies, inequalities and loopholes. These reforms are long overdue.

I should like to say a word or two about the regulations generally. There does not seem to be any elasticity in the regulations. There is no flexibility and I think the whole position should be reviewed. I know there are grave dangers, but if the proper boards are set up I think the advantage of flexibility will outweigh any other disadvantages.

I had intended to say something about the statement made yesterday by the Prime Minister on man-power mobilization. This is a huge subject matter which requires a great deal of thought and much more knowledge than I possess at the moment. I have not even been able to read the Prime Minister's statement, let alone study the orders in council. But I will say this: what I understand of the announcement does not nearly measure up to the advance press notices. I am convinced now that government propaganda is not factual, but is propaganda pure and simple. The statement made by the Prime Minister, as opposed to the advance notices, indicates that the policy has been whittled down to a degree. Considerable teeth have been taken out. That is the first observation I want to make.

My second observation is that it is apparent that the government is approaching the problem of man-power for the army and other services by the indirect route rather than by the direct approach. According to the Prime Minister, we are to have an extended national selective service plan, designed to accelerate Canada's war effort through application of what he terms the "negative compulsion of restriction". I am not going to pause to analyse what that high-sounding phrase means, but it is opposed to the positive compulsion of allocation. The young men of this country between the ages of nineteen and thirty-five are in effect told definitely that they are to join the army or starve.

[Mr. Hanson (York-Sunbury).]

Then there is a policy with respect to farmers, which I have not quite analysed yet. But I shall say this, that the steps announced by the Prime Minister yesterday fall far short of complete national selective service. They are steps in the right direction, and good steps, but they do not go the whole way. Food production is being taken care of, and of course that is very important, not only to sustain the morale of our civilian population but also the armed forces, and to feed our gallant defenders overseas.

Employment in a restricted list of non-essential occupations is to be curbed—what the Minister of Labour is reported to have termed the "golden slipper" jobs—a striking phrase, and one which sounds well, though I do not know how much it means; nobody knows. Authority is given to the Minister of Labour to obtain skilled technicians for war work. But this I say, in criticism of the plan, and in the hope that it will stimulate the government to go further: the plan appears to fall short of making provision certain that every job which has to be filled will be filled by the most competent man. Without this, any plan fails.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the motion? Carried.

Mr. CHURCH: I move the adjournment of the debate.

(The house in committee on the resolution, Mr. Vien in the chair.)

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): No, it is not carried. The debate was adjourned by the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Church). He has been waiting to speak.

An hon. MEMBER: No.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Or by one hon. member. The motion is not carried. I object.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: As hon. members are aware, these particular resolutions are to be followed by bills which will have to pass another house as well as this. All the bills which will be before the house between now and the Easter recess will relate to the war effort or supply; and I was going to suggest, unless it appeared to limit or restrict in any way what hon. members might wish to say, that the speeches on the war effort could take place on any one or other of the resolutions. As regards the resolution with respect to the war appropriation of two billion dollars, there will be no effort to put that through before Easter, but there may be time on Friday for debating it, and in that event speeches could be made at that time on the war effort. I think it might suit

the convenience of hon. members generally if we got into committee on one or two of these resolutions, and such speeches as may be of very brief duration could be made in committee instead of on the resolution with the Speaker in the chair. Speeches at greater length with the Speaker in the chair could be made on the resolution with respect to the war appropriation bill. I believe that if my hon. friend understood that he would join with us in this matter.

Mr. MacINNIS: Will not the two billion dollar resolution also have to go into committee if we are to make an interim appropriation of \$500,000,000?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No.

Mr. MacINNIS: That will put all the resolutions in the same category?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No, that is not necessary. It is necessary that the resolution should be before the house. It has been before the house and is before the house on the order paper for consideration in committee of the whole. We could not have got the proportion voted if the resolution itself had not been introduced and a motion made to have it discussed in committee.

Mr. CHURCH: I cannot make my speech in committee. I gave way this afternoon to two or three other speakers, to let them go on.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I suggest to you that there was in the hands of Mr. Speaker a whole list of speakers. The balance has been upset by the intervention of the Prime Minister this afternoon—which was quite right; he should speak—and perhaps I spoke longer than I should; but I do not think that we should rush through this debate. We shall get through on Friday by six o'clock.

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes. But there is the senate.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Oh! Well, I should not laugh at that. The hon. gentleman is concerned for the senate!

Mr. ILSLEY: I am not concerned with the senate, but I am concerned with the money to carry on the war, and I cannot get it unless I get a bill through this house and a bill through the senate. What I would suggest—if this would meet the convenience of the house—is that this \$135,000,000 measure be carried through all stages to-morrow, and also that the \$500,000,000 interim supply, which is No. 12 on the order paper, and the supplementary estimates which are before the committee of the whole, and the interim

one-sixth of the main estimates, go through all stages to-morrow. If those are all through by to-morrow night they can go to the senate and the senate can pass those bills on Friday. Meanwhile no one will be prejudiced in the slightest degree, because there will still be the two billion dollar resolution, which is in committee, and discussion can go on upon that all day, every day. I am not asking the house to do anything which prejudices any single hon. member or prevents any hon. member from making a speech which he desires to make. But I suggest that that would be a businesslike way of dealing with this matter, and I am merely asking the house to carry out the programme which I suggested a little over a week ago it would be necessary for us to carry through before Easter.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): So far as I am concerned, I promised the minister a week ago that I would help him to get these measures through before the house adjourned. I am in honour bound to help him do that; and if the government wants to do it this way, why, I am content. I cannot, I should not, do anything else.

Mr. GREEN: Is there not to be any statement made by the Minister of National Defence? We can sit in committee to-morrow on this resolution.

Mr. RALSTON: I am prepared to make the statement at any time, but really I may be pardoned if I suggest that the Minister of National Defence will endeavour to make a statement at such time as may be opportune. I do not think that it is up to any hon. member to bid him at any time to make a statement. The leader of the opposition suggested the other evening that a statement be made by the ministry. The statement has been made by the Prime Minister. As the Minister of Finance has indicated, there will be ample opportunity in connection with the two billion dollar resolution to make any statement and to discuss in full the matter of the carrying on of the war; but I do suggest that it seems to be a waste of valuable time to do that twice—on this resolution and on the other one too.

I have talked to my hon. friend a good many times and he has heard me make a good many statements. I do not know that my voice is so pleasing to him that I should get up just for the purpose of making a statement; if I made one, there are three ministers of national defence, and all of them should make statements if one did. But we thought that in connection with this war appropriation bill we