

was, she replied—evidently she was an omnivorous reader of *Hansard*—"It is not in the public interest to give the information."

We must be given all information that is not of a strictly confidential character. Let us understand that it is the public of Canada who are paying the shot, and they have a right to know what is going on and how their money is being spent. Therefore I ask the Prime Minister in his address this afternoon to give the public full information as to how our present military requirements are being met. Has our army sufficient men overseas, and have we sufficient reinforcements to maintain our military strength at what it should be? I want him to give the facts and the figures on that point. As the session progresses we shall expect to have unfolded a further man-power plan. The whole problem of man-power—I say this guardedly and advisedly—has never been tackled courageously by this administration since the war began. The Prime Minister has been good enough to accept many of our policies; he should not be disturbed if I ask him to accept another. Here is the policy that was adopted by the Progressive Conservative party at its convention in Winnipeg on December 11:

Recognizing that the world struggle in which Canada is engaged requires a total war effort, we believe in compulsory national selective service, and that all those selected to serve in the armed forces should be available for service wherever required. We believe in the effective total utilization and proper allocation for war, by compulsion where necessary, of all the resources of Canada, including agriculture, industry and finance,—

I ask some of my friends to my left to listen to that last word.

—as well as man-power, and that our aim should be at all times to bring about so far as human means can achieve it, an equality in sacrifice.

Others of our party will perhaps deal more fully with the question of man-power and our armed forces than I intend to do on this particular occasion. It can scarcely be gainsaid that the government's policy on man-power has failed. There has been no courageous, no determined and no effective plan for a complete and scientific utilization of our man- and woman-power since the war started. There has been no master plan. There has been no coordination. Indeed, it seems to me from watching affairs in the house that industry, agriculture and the armed forces, instead of working in coordination, have actually been in competition with each other for the man- and woman-power available in Canada.

The selective service policy, while it was pretty long in promises, has been pretty short in performance. Its enforcement, especially

in recent days, has been weak and timorous. The lack of a master man-power plan in Canada has had a disastrous effect, and has contributed in no small degree—this is the sad part of it—to the weakening of our general war effort. The haphazard, hit-or-miss system which has been followed throughout these critical years has resulted in a drift from agriculture into war work, and enlistment in the armed forces, thus creating one of the most dangerous problems in connection with food with which Canada has ever been faced.

Actually there are many to-day in rural districts who believe that we will face an agricultural production crisis in Canada in the months that lie ahead. In war time the necessity becomes apparent of every man and woman in the dominion doing the job which will enable him or her to make the maximum contribution toward the winning of the war. In this connection the responsibility of leadership rests very largely upon the government of the day. The failure of the government to adopt and to provide an adequate plan for the effective use of Canada's man and woman power stands as a serious obstacle to a full national effort at this time. It is late, and much of the damage has been done, but there is still time to retrieve some of the losses. I plead earnestly with the government to deal with this matter immediately and with determination. The omission from the speech from the throne of any measures to meet this urgent national problem is hard to understand, because the crisis is here.

I should like to preface my remarks on the subject of labour with a strictly personal note. Labour and agriculture have been responsible for my election to the House of Commons on two successive occasions. I have, I believe, a clear perspective of the problems of the working man and his family. I believe it is essential to have a personal understanding of those who comprise that great section of our population. I have been fortunate in having lived in a working man's district in my home town, and I still continue to do so. So that when I speak of labour I speak of it not in theoretical terms; I speak of the working man as a neighbour of mine. The working man is a loyal and constant friend of those whom he trusts, and he realizes very quickly and very well those he can trust. His lot has not been what it should have been through these years, and in my opinion he has not enlisted the degree of sympathy and understanding in public men and the public at large to which he is justly entitled. Those of us who have pleaded his cause through the years in parliament have done so in the full knowledge that if ever a