

with regard to voluntary enlistment? I have not before me the figures of the monthly quotas required, but I understand that the quota for military district No. 7, which is the New Brunswick district—and which I am proud to say has filled its quota at all times up to the present—is something like 450 men a month. I am speaking subject to correction, of course, because I have not verified the figures. But I am told that since this drive for recruits has been in progress that district has enlisted only a little more than half that number. I frankly confess that I am astonished at that. I had thought that New Brunswick, where there is no national war work of any consequence going on, would have been able to produce at least 450 men each month by the voluntary system, if the information which I have just given the house is correct. I regret it very much indeed. What is the situation throughout Canada? I am going to ask the minister if he will tell us, when he makes his statement, what are the monthly objectives, and a little later I will have some further questions which I shall leave with him.

Do we know what are our potentialities in Canada? In August, 1940, we had a national registration which cost us over a million dollars. So far as I know it has been used only for the purposes of the four months' training plan. Perhaps that statement is too sweeping; but do we know, in terms of numbers, what are our potentialities in regard to man-power for war, for industrial production and for agricultural purposes?

Now I want to make a personal reference. Recently I made a speech in Toronto. Perhaps it is a mistake to make speeches; I do not know, but that speech has been completely misinterpreted by the press. On that occasion I briefly referred to the question of compulsory national service and said that in my opinion it should not be treated as a political issue. At the moment it is not a party issue. At the moment it is no matter for party or partisan strife. It is too serious for that. At the moment—and I hope always—it is a national problem which we must all consider as Canadians, not as Liberals, Conservatives. In my view it transcends political or partisan advantages. That was the purport of the message I gave in Toronto. The crisis is now too serious for any party to endeavour to gain partisan advantage from the issue. This country must wage total war with a total effort. I went farther and stated that leaders of public opinion outside the house have a heavy responsibility resting upon them. It is their duty to make known their views to the country and to the government. Some of

[Mr. R. B. Hanson.]

them I believe are accepting that responsibility. Leaders of public opinion outside the house can educate the public on this question without the risk of raising untimely political controversy, and I believe that they have a duty to do so.

I did not hesitate to make known my own personal views. I believe the greatest responsibility rests on the Prime Minister. As Prime Minister, as the representative of the people and as a Canadian charged with the responsibility of government, he should declare his position, and I invite him to do so. Will the Prime Minister give a clear and specific statement of his position, and tell the country how it is possible to wage total war without total effort? The responsibility is his and that of the government. If the situation is that we are in a total war and are to have a total war effort, then the duty of the government is clear, namely, to put into effect measures which will ensure the full utilization of all the resources of the country, for service in any capacity.

I had intended to say something about production, but I shall not weary the house on that score. Production in England is growing by leaps and bounds. I wish I could tell what was told to me by one of the cabinet ministers, but I cannot. I should like to say, however, that I appreciate now more than I ever did before the reticence which has been shown as to revealing terms of production. Of course we in this country were fed up with statements to the effect that production was well up to schedule, or ahead of schedule, and all that sort of thing. It did not mean a thing to us. But over there they made it quite clear that they do not release the terms of production, and I understand the reason for it.

I should like to have this thought made clear—and it was made clear by Mr. Churchill in the speech he made in the British House of Commons on September 30, to which I had the pleasure of listening—that aircraft production in the United Kingdom is to-day ahead of the best Germany ever had. I believe I can say that. To give anything in the nature of figures would be only a guess. I think I could give an intelligent guess, but I do not believe it would be right for me to do so.

Definitely, production of aircraft in the United Kingdom is as good as or better than Hitler has had at any time. That is the information I have. I am told, too, that that production will increase, and with the aid of our great neighbour to the south it will bring superiority. Mr. Churchill definitely declared in his speech that with respect to the channel and western Europe there is superiority in the air. That is the claim for British arms to-day.