

*War Appropriation*

Defence, and this is what the minister for air said. I quote the headline—"Power reports coast defences much improved." They were improved overnight!

Further, to correct the impression that had been left by himself, the Minister of National Defence gave an interview, which is headed "Ralston impressed by competence of coastal defenders." He had not been impressed by the Pacific coast defence, but he was impressed by the coastal defenders, who were probably men from Témiscouata. They made a great impression on him.

Then, on April 2, as reported in the *Citizen* of April 3, the minister for air said, according to the headlines, "pilots not needed in Britain now—asserts so many overseas, no more wanted at present—foresees Canadian defence expansion." Then the Minister of National Defence again plunged into this matter of Pacific coast defence. At Winnipeg the Minister of National Defence gave another interview:

Ralston gives men warning on joining reserve army—may find themselves ordered to join up if they fail to do so voluntarily, defence minister says.

That was the heading of a Canadian Press dispatch from Winnipeg, dated April 6. The Minister of National Defence then went to Halifax to inspect our defences.

I have another clipping here, dated Victoria, B.C., April 1, headed: "May conscript men for reserve army—Ralston." That is what the Minister of National Defence said at Victoria, and he repeated this at Winnipeg on his way back to Ottawa.

Here is another clipping dated March 27, headed:

Married men of 30-35 may join reserve army, defence minister says—new order being issued permits those in these age categories to enlist. Previously recruits for reserve army had been limited to youths under 19 and men between 35 and 50 years. Colonel Ralston states it will cost nearly 600 millions to maintain army overseas in next fiscal year.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: If the hon. member will permit a question to clear up a doubt in my mind, am I to understand that he does not entirely approve the Minister of National Defence?

Mr. POULIOT: I hold the same views with regard to the Minister of National Defence as my hon. friend the member for Fraser Valley does.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Then let me express mine for the rest of the evening.

Mr. POULIOT: Since the minister does not seem to know our views, I have to tell him what they are.

[Mr. Pouliot.]

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask a question of the minister.

Mr. ROEBUCK: Mr. Chairman, I rise to a question of privilege.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN: A question of privilege is in order at any time.

Mr. ROEBUCK: I want to call the attention of the hon. member for Témiscouata to something that he mentioned in the early part of his speech. He was denouncing racial intolerance in his rounded style, and of course he knows that I agree with him in any denunciation, no matter how vigorous it may be, of racial, religious or any other type of intolerance. The hon. member for Témiscouata spoke of some Jewish gentleman holding an officer's position in the province of Quebec and he asked: "What would be said were a similar condition to exist in the province of Ontario?"

Mr. ROSS (Souris): What is the question of privilege?

Mr. ROEBUCK: I think it is a question of privilege. At any rate it is one of indulgence, if not of privilege, and my hon. friend across the aisle waived his right to proceed.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): The Chairman said I must.

Mr. ROEBUCK: I am not saying that you must.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chairman must consider the facts as he sees them. The hon. member for Souris sat down, I understand to allow the hon. member for Trinity to proceed.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Only after the hon. member for Trinity had said that he was rising to a question of privilege. We want to know what the question of privilege is. The hon. member for Souris did not waive his right to allow the hon. member for Trinity to make a speech.

The CHAIRMAN: I understand that the remarks which the hon. member for Trinity is proceeding to make are of the nature of a question of privilege in respect to the remarks that have been made pertaining to racial prejudice.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): But he must state what his question of privilege is.

Mr. ROEBUCK: It is with respect to my own province, Mr. Chairman, and with respect to my own constituency. My hon. friend intimated that there would be objection to