

is only one deferment granted at one time, but there is nothing which makes it positive that another deferment will not be granted. Secondly, it is a matter for the board to decide whether or not the case is one of emergency, and of the kind my hon. friend has in mind.

Mr. CHURCH: What about those in the cities who want exemptions?

Mr. T. C. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Mr. Speaker, following up the questions already asked with reference to farmers' sons in training being given leave to help with spring seeding, I would ask the Minister of National Defence this question. Such cases as I have had come to my attention I have referred to the Deputy Minister of National Defence, who has been very considerate and suggested that if the men will make application to their commanding officer consideration will be given to such applications. But most of these men do not know that, and the result is that scores of letters on the subject are coming to almost every member representing a rural constituency. Would the minister give consideration to having a statement printed in army orders to the effect that where men are needed at home on the farm and can be spared, leave can be had by applying to the commanding officer?

Mr. RALSTON: I would not want to have a statement made in quite that way, but I will see if some statement can be prepared with regard to the procedure in cases of the kind. Very recently we have made a rule which I think will be made uniform, that where men are actually in the army—not just those who have been called up and have not yet actually reported—we are referring such cases of men actually in the army, at least in the early stages of their training, to these boards. We are asking the Minister of National War Services to request his boards to look into these cases so that they may be dealt with on a uniform basis, and not on the basis of what one commanding officer may think in one place and another may think in another. This will help to get a set of principles laid down with respect to these men being entitled to deferment if deferment seems to be required.

DEFERMENT OF SERVICE OF FOURTH SON FOR BUSINESS REASONS

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): I should like to ask a question of the Minister of National Defence which arises out of the question asked by the hon. member for Lincoln. A widow has three sons who have enlisted voluntarily for service in England and she wants to have a fourth son kept home for business reasons, but the tribunal ruled against [Mr. Ralston.]

her. There should not be conscription in some homes and not in others. Are any instructions issued to the tribunals in these matters?

Hon. J. L. RALSTON (Minister of National Defence): If I understand my hon. friend aright his question is: are any instructions issued with regard to business men?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): To the tribunals.

Mr. RALSTON: That question is really one which ought to be referred to my colleague, the Minister of National War Services. No instructions are issued to tribunals by my department in that respect.

[Later:]

Mr. CHURCH: Can the Minister of National War Services give me an answer to the question I asked a few moments ago?

POSTPONEMENT FOR FIFTH SON

Mr. JEAN-FRANÇOIS POULIOT (Témiscouata): I should like to ask any of the war ministers or the Minister of National War Services if a man who has four sons who have enlisted voluntarily in the army can secure an indefinite postponement of training for the fifth son?

Hon. J. T. THORSON (Minister of National War Services): The matter is covered by the national war services regulations which are administered by divisional boards. It is within the discretion of the board to grant a postponement, but each postponement is confined to a limit of six months. There is nothing to prevent a board from granting either one or more extensions of such postponement.

SECOND VICTORY LOAN

RETURNS FROM ONTARIO—VILLAGE OF OMEMEE AND TOWNSHIP OF EMILY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. BRUCE McNEVIN (Victoria, Ont.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. I note in this morning's *Globe and Mail* a report with regard to those Ontario municipalities which were first in reaching their allotments in connection with the victory loan. I have not the slightest desire in any way to detract from the splendid record of these municipalities. However, in order that the record may be clear, may I say that the village of Omemee and the township of Emily exceeded their objective of \$65,000, by six and one-half per cent within fifteen minutes after the victory loan offices opened on the morning of Monday, February 16. I believe there should be a word of commendation for the

joint chairmen of these municipalities, Rev. R. M. Patterson of Omemee and Rev. Father McFadden of Downeyville. The canvassers Messrs. D. Weir, A. Carroll and A. McQuade are still going strong and have exceeded the sum of \$100,000.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I believe that is not a question of privilege.

RETURNS FROM QUEBEC—MEGANTIC COUNTY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. JOSEPH LAFONTAINE (Megantic-Frontenac): I should like to read a telegram which I received yesterday, reading as follows:

We take pleasure in advising you that Megantic county has to-day obtained and passed its objective of one million and four hundred thousand dollars. We understand this is the first county in the province of Quebec to reach its objective.

A. S. Johnson,  
J. A. Forand,  
Joint Chairmen, victory loan  
committee, county Megantic

PRIVILEGE—Mr. KINLEY

OTTAWA HOUSING CONDITIONS—COMMENT OF MAYOR LEWIS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. J. KINLEY (Queens-Lunenburg): Mr. Speaker, I desire to bring to the attention of the house an article appearing in to-day's issue of the *Ottawa Morning Journal*. It stands as the chief item of news on the front page, and refers to a statement made by his worship the Mayor of Ottawa. The news item is as follows:

Mayor Tells M.P.'s to Go Home  
Make Room for War Workers

"Some of these M.P.'s who are wasting their time around Ottawa should go home so that their offices could be used by war workers," Mayor Lewis declared at Board of Control on Tuesday.

Then what appears to be the motive follows:

Mr. Lewis made his remarks after the board had endorsed the stand taken by G. Russell Boucher, M.P. for Carleton county, in the House of Commons on Monday night for an upward revision of the \$100,000 granted annually to the city in lieu of taxes.

Then the article goes on to say:

Controllers Geldert and Pickering agreed with Mayor Lewis that the government had created the serious housing situation in the capital and was doing nothing to relieve the shortage of accommodation.

May I bring to the attention of the Prime Minister certain press dispatches which indicate that in Washington, where there is a

similar condition, some departments of government are being moved to other cities. It might be a splendid idea, for instance, to remove the naval department to the coast.

Some hon. MEMBERS: East coast.

Some hon. MEMBERS: West coast.

Mr. KINLEY: And the Department of Agriculture to Winnipeg. Then, with respect to the personal affront indicated in the article, may I point out that most members of parliament are proud of the national capital, and naturally we are chagrined by the discourteous remark of the chief magistrate of the city of Ottawa.

Mr. HOMUTH: He knows only the Liberal members.

Mr. KINLEY: Most of us would be busy at home. But that is one of the tests people usually apply before sending us here.

It seems to me that the criticisms about members of parliament are hard to understand, especially in war time. If a debate continues for a long time in the house, we are accused of wasting the country's time. On the other hand, if hon. members do not speak, it is said that they are dumb. So far as I am concerned, practical business is usually run in a harmonious and quiet manner. To my mind that is the most effective kind of business. But it seems that sections of the press and some people across the country want us to put on a show.

Mr. PINARD: On a point of order, my hon. friend is complaining about the city of Ottawa.

Mr. KINLEY: I have the floor.

Mr. PINARD: Sit down, please. The hon. member says that he is speaking to a point of privilege. I am speaking to a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Queens-Lunenburg (Mr. Kinley) has introduced a question of privilege concerning an item appearing in a newspaper. He has extended his observations as far as he should, in the circumstances.

Mr. KINLEY: I should like to say just a word more, because this article is an affront to members of the house.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member should confine his remarks to the question of privilege.

Mr. KINLEY: Most of the criticism of members of parliament seems to be by people who do not understand just what we do. Some seem to think that the whole performance of a member is spread upon *Hansard*.