

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Just pure hearsay.

Mr. RALSTON: I am asking, does the hon. member know the gentleman who was spoken to in that way by the officer?

Mr. POULIOT: It was in all the papers of Quebec, and I will send a clipping—

Mr. RALSTON: I am not talking about papers. I am interested to know if the hon. member knew the gentleman, if he had any information himself.

Mr. POULIOT: I cannot be everywhere at the same time.

Mr. RALSTON: I asked my hon. friend just one question, that is all.

Mr. POULIOT: Oh, yes, it is all right; but I wonder whether the minister will make an investigation to know who speaks like that to French-Canadians to provoke them. I have already mentioned in this chamber the case of a lady who received a visit one day from soldiers who came to arrest her husband who was supposed to be a deserter, while he was in England serving with his majesty's forces.

Mr. RALSTON: Would my hon. friend mind letting me see the newspaper clipping? All I am asking for is the name of the gentleman who was spoken to in that way. If he will give me the name of the officer or non-commissioned officer, or any information about the matter, he may be sure I shall investigate it.

Mr. POULIOT: I have another clipping from *Le Soleil*. I will give it to the minister.

Mr. RALSTON: I will just point out that apparently there is no mention of either the name of the gentleman who was spoken to or the person who spoke to him.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Just pure gossip.

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend says that just because it is stated in the newspaper, that makes it true.

Mr. POULIOT: Oh, no.

Mr. RALSTON: If my hon. friend will give me any particulars of the gentleman who says he was spoken to in that way, I shall be very glad to have an investigation made in the most thorough possible manner.

Mr. POULIOT: On the other hand, when I reported the case of a man who was put in gaol because he had spoken French, the minister took advantage of the fact that there was an airport of the same name as the military camp there and he gave an answer relating to the military camp when I was speaking of the airport.

Mr. RALSTON: We may as well settle this now. I gave my hon. friend the fullest information; in fact I went further than I need have gone. My hon. friend did not take the trouble to find out what camp it was. He immediately assumed that it had to do with the Department of National Defence, and proceeded to make a charge about it. He found that it was not the army; that it was the air force, and he thinks I should have investigated the air force before I made any reply. I disclaimed that responsibility at the time, and I do so again.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): On the assumption that this debate is not going on, I desire to ask the minister one or two questions. Possibly we have heard enough of the kind of stuff that has been put on the record to-night. So I desire to direct the minister's attention to a situation with respect to recruiting which I think deserves some explanation from him.

A young man enlisting for active service overseas may, after a lapse of time, and his conduct being exemplary, apply to his commanding officer for leave to marry, and if the conditions are fulfilled he may get the consent of his commanding officer and he may marry, with the result that his wife gets dependent's allowance. A young man called up for training under the National Resources Mobilization Act may not marry, under the regulations, even with the consent of his commanding officer; and when he applies to his commanding officer, I believe, invariably the man is told what the position is, that so long as he has not enlisted for overseas service he may not marry. I have only to state the two positions for hon. gentlemen to understand the significance of the leverage on the young man in the training centre to enlist for overseas service. I cannot imagine any condition that would be more conducive to forcing men into enlistment for overseas service than desiring to marry and being prevented from doing so by the regulations of the department. I put it to the minister—and I do not want to generate any heat about the matter—that the situation which I have portrayed, and I believe accurately, is to say the least not creditable to this country. It is the back-door approach again to compulsory enlistment.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Does the hon. gentleman not believe in conscription?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Yes, but let us be man-fashioned about it, and enter by the front-door and not by the back-door route.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Why talk about "total war," then?