

a Jewish officer in the army in my province, and I think I am right in claiming privilege in order to set that right. There is where the privilege lies.

I want to point out to this committee that there are at least two Jewish officers from Ontario whom I can name, because they are in public life. One is, now, Captain Croll, from the provincial legislature; and the other is Lieutenant Factor, from this house. I want to state emphatically that I have never heard in Ontario or in the city of Toronto any objection based on those facts.

I do not want to claim for my Ontario compatriots greater virtue than they possess. I like to give them more credit, perhaps, than is their due, rather than less; I like to err on the side of too much rather than too little credit.

It is true that we have classes in Ontario. I do not doubt that Catholics like Catholics better than they like Protestants; that Protestants perhaps like Protestants better than they like Catholics, and the two may like themselves better than they like the Jews; Jews may like themselves better than they do some other class. That is natural. But I think it should not go abroad that there is any distinction in the position of officers in the army, as between these various classes of religion or race. I am satisfied that whatever intolerance you may meet with from individuals—and sometimes things occur in organizations such as the army which are regrettable; I have heard of them—the great masses of the people of our province would disapprove in the strongest terms any distinction being made as between the members of these classes. Our people are prepared to accord to Jew and Gentile, Protestant and Catholic alike, the credit which is coming to them for their ability and service, and the promotion which they may win in the army or anywhere else, quite irrespective of racial prejudice. I am sure that the hon. member for Témiscouata will be glad to hear me say that, and I hope that he will agree with me.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I appreciate all that has been said by the hon. member for Trinity. We have listened to my good friend the hon. member for Témiscouata for two periods of forty minutes within a period of an hour and a half this evening, and I confess I think that in some respects he did his people an injustice. Many times in this chamber I have refrained from saying something which might foster racial misunderstanding in this country. He has given the results of quotas filled and percentages by provinces, and I believe that in so doing he placed the actual facts in a false

light, because quotas are not based on a population or per capita basis in this country; I think that is true. I have here a return given on December 31, 1941, on a percentage basis of voluntary enlistments for the active army, the air force and the navy. The percentages by provinces are as follows:

	Per cent
Alberta	5.0
Saskatchewan	3.7
Manitoba	5.7
Ontario	4.6
Quebec	2.3
British Columbia.....	5.7
New Brunswick.....	5.4
Nova Scotia.....	6.0

I believe that those figures are based on the actual numbers who have volunteered for service in all of the armed forces. I listened some time ago to an explanation by the Minister of National Defence for Air of how these quotas were set up. I am satisfied that they are not set up on a per capita basis or according to the population of the various districts or provinces. Would the Minister of National Defence now explain just how those quotas are established? I believe he will say that they are not established according to population, and he might give us an explanation as to the basis upon which they are set up. I believe the public throughout the dominion would welcome this information at the present time.

Mr. RALSTON: I may say to my hon. friend that I was asked the same question last evening, and I stated at that time the general principles on which the quotas were based. They are also set out in a return which must be somewhere near the return from which my hon. friend has quoted.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): They are not based on population.

Mr. RALSTON: They are based on population and on activity in the particular district in connection with the active and non-permanent militia, and on recruiting records.

Mr. McCANN: The hon. member for Témiscouata has run the gamut of the most imaginative and exhaustive catechism which one can conceive of, but he has left one or two questions on which I should like a little enlightenment, and to which he did not refer.

One has to do with a call which is being made in military district No. 3. It appears that men from twenty-one to thirty years of age are being called there for military service, whereas in other military districts more thickly populated the call is for men from twenty-one to twenty-five. I can understand that probably the reason for that is that the quota