

The leader of the opposition dwelt at some length upon what he said was a mistaken attitude in the government's war effort, namely, putting Canada first. I touched upon that just before the recess. He seemed to think that we ought to put Britain first. May I remind him that it was not this party, it was not the members on this side of the house that created a "Canada first" policy and tried to educate the Canadian people in their attitude towards interimperial relations on a "Canada first" point of view. At the time the "Canada first" cry was raised I protested against it as strongly as I could. I felt that the day would come when those who were responsible for it would wish very much that they had not made it quite so prominent in the ears of the young people who were then growing up in this country. It always represented to my mind a grossly selfish and unfair attitude in interimperial relations, and I am glad that my hon. friend has to-day repudiated a cry under which at one time he came back into this House of Commons as a member.

The leader of the opposition went on to speak at some length of Canada's war effort. He asked many questions of the ministry in regard to matters pertaining to the different departments. I shall leave to my colleagues, the ministers of the different departments of defence, the Minister of Munitions and Supply, the Minister of War Services and the Minister of Finance, replies which I think they are better qualified to make than I am, and which would come more appropriately from them. But I do wish to answer at once the statement made by my hon. friend that, because of a single article which he quoted from a New York paper, the opinion which is held of Canada's war effort is that on the whole it has been inadequate. My hon. friend quoted from a statement made by Mr. Hanson W. Baldwin, the military critic of the New York *Times*. Almost any article, written by whoever it may be, is capable of the kind of interpretation which the reader may wish to put upon it. Particularly in an article which is to a large extent descriptive, which covers a lot of ground, which tries to view a situation, not in the light of the moment only, but in the light of passing events, and in the light of the future as well, can anyone place upon its paragraphs the interpretation which he pleases.

My hon. friend has chosen a few paragraphs from this particular article and apart from the text as a whole has cited them as the reason for changing his mind about the necessity of having parliament meet earlier than it otherwise might have met. He had not realized, until he read the words of a military critic, that we could be as far behind in our

war effort as we are, and he cited the statement of Mr. Baldwin that he found what were termed "bottle-necks" with respect to the development of some of our industries, that he found shortages here and insufficiencies there. May I say to my hon. friend and to hon. members that bottle-necks, shortages and such things are inevitable among the preparations for war. No country has escaped them, not a single country, as my hon. friend well knows. The fact that there should be here and there limitations in our war effort is inevitable. The change from a peace-time economy to one of war is a tremendous change, it takes time. If my hon. friend wants to get illustrations of how difficult it has been for nations to make that transition he does not need to begin criticizing his own country's effort, but could find instances of it in every country that is engaged in this war or fears its possibilities.

My hon. friend did not stress what, after all, was the real opinion of Mr. Baldwin, as those like myself who talked with him well know, namely, one of tremendous admiration for the war effort of this country and appreciation of the speed with which it had been carried on. Let me read just two paragraphs which my hon. friend did not quote but which I think will be sufficient to answer those he did quote. I read from the report of Mr. Baldwin's statement that appeared in the *Montreal Gazette* of October 2, 1940. It is a full reproduction of the article in the *Times*:

Nevertheless an inspection of air force, army and centres from Hamilton, Ontario, to Halifax, Nova Scotia, showed that Canada's defence establishments have been tremendously expanded in a year of war, that her programmes to aid Great Britain and to defend herself have been considerably modified, expanded and speeded since the German blitzkrieg of May and June; and that to-day the great majority of Canada's 11,315,000 people are wholeheartedly behind the dominion's war effort. That effort is now passing its preliminary planning and plant expansion stage, and with increasing speed will commence to prove a factor in the war.

And the concluding two paragraphs, summing up the essence of the whole article:

The Canadian war effort—definitely aligned with and therefore influenced and limited by the British war effort at the start of the war—is still complicated by the necessity of reconciling the needs of North American defence with the necessity of waging a war abroad. The programme, still far from its peak, was slow in starting through no fault of Canada. It is now commencing to mesh into gear, though it will still be eight to twelve months before the Canadian effort becomes a major factor in the war.

What could we ask more than that? I would be prepared to go before the Canadian people at any time and ask, everything considered, if that is not a record of which they