

*War Appropriation—Army*

of the committee, who now sit on the treasury benches, were one with us in complaining about it. It was just a catch for the examiners to do what they pleased with the candidate, through examination. Imagine that! We were discussing those matters. The matter came before the committee. There was not a single member of the twenty-five who did not protest against that "personality" business. Personality and appearance—imagine! If a man was to the liking of the examiner, he got all his marks for personality. But if the examiner had something against him, he got no marks at all. They were asked what it was, but no one could answer. A reference to a dictionary is no answer, either. We should know more about it.

Hon. members will be surprised by that. In the first place when I fought for the common civil servant in Ottawa, I was not alone. I was with the other members of the committee. But what trouble did I have at first to open the eyes of the House of Commons to what was going on in the civil service commission! We did not have much success in our recommendations. However, at least we opened the eyes of some of our colleagues as to what was going on around there.

Before we undertook that work no one had mentioned the word "bureaucracy." Now it is in the programme of one of the major parties, namely, the correcting of bureaucracy. Whether they will do it or not, I do not know. But there is bureaucracy in the army, as there is in the civil service. That is the kind of reform we want to have. To members of parliament nothing of that kind should be secret. We should be informed about it. We should be informed, so that we might prevent injustices being done. The minister renders no service to the army and renders no service to the personnel to his department by covering up what is done there, and by saying that everything is right.

It is hard at times to rise and protest, and always be told that we are wrong, and always that the other fellow is right. The minister praises the district medical officer of Quebec. Was he not a son-in-law of the former mayor of Quebec, who was under the mobilization board? And the old man was unjust to the draftees, just to boost his son-in-law. Everybody knows it in Quebec. The minister does not know the politics of Quebec city. Let me tell him that the old father-in-law was a key man in Quebec East, and he was appointed there at a time when the present minister was not minister. But he was a key man there. And now—now the boss of the board in Quebec city is precisely the daughter of one of the key men of the political clubs of Quebec

[Mr. Pouliot.]

East. When I speak of political strings I know of what I speak. I know that one has to make obeisance to that person in order to have service from her.

May I submit more than that, that even when the national selective service headquarters in Ottawa wrote to the chairman of the board in Quebec city, he did not answer. I had to direct their attention to the fact that Quebec did not answer when an answer was requested by Ottawa.

Mr. RALSTON: Would the hon. member permit me—

Mr. POULIOT: It is not the same thing; I am not blaming the minister for it; but I am informing the committee of the many reasons I have to say that there were political strings; and even if the minister canonizes them I will so express myself.

Mr. RALSTON: Is the hon. member charging that the medical board at Quebec is bossed by some young lady?

Mr. POULIOT: No, I did not say that. And I am not talking of flirtations, but of office routine.

Mr. RALSTON: The hon. member cannot laugh that off. I want to know whether or not he is charging the medical board in Quebec with being bossed by a certain young lady, of whom I have never heard at all? It is gross calumny, if he is suggesting any such thing.

Mr. POULIOT: Once again the minister does not understand what I say, or know that the person is secretary to one of the members of the mobilization board in Quebec. There is no love affair between them. It is not that I insinuated, at all.

Mr. RALSTON: No one suggested it.

Mr. POULIOT: If no one suggested it, so much the better. But what I say is that when we have a man in charge, he should be running the business, and the business should not be run by a secretary.

Mr. RALSTON: Does the hon. member charge that the medical officer is run by his secretary?

Mr. POULIOT: No, not a bit of it.

Mr. RALSTON: Then I suggest to the hon. member he should stick to the item, instead of talking of national selective service.

Mr. POULIOT: I told the minister five minutes ago I was not speaking of his department, but by way of comparison.