

not forthcoming, Beaufort airframes were modified to take a twin-row Wasp engine, manufacture of which was begun in Australia.

According to a press report in the Sydney *Morning Herald*, January 11, 1941, the Australian Minister of Munitions, Senator McBride, stated that Australia's production for war now included:

Guns: 3·7 and 3" 20 hundredweight anti-aircraft guns in production now.

Gun ammunition: a complete range of components in full production, including shell bodies, fuses, primers, cartridge-cases, cartridge-bags, mortar bombs, hand-grenades, and aircraft bombs, ranging from 8½-pound practice type to 250-pound service pattern.

Explosives: A complete range of service explosives including propellants, high explosives, and pyrotechnic materials, in full mass production. These were being assembled into complete rounds of gun ammunition, produced from Australian raw material, and covering the entire range in use in the army and navy.

Small arms ammunitions: Production mostly of the Red Label class, the highest quality, made especially for use in aircraft machine guns. Armour-piercing, tracer, and incendiary types also produced.

Small arms: Rifles, Lewis gun components, land service and also right and left air-cooled aircraft patterns.

Precision instruments and optical munitions for equipment of artillery, including searchlight equipment.

Armoured fighting vehicles: Machine-gun carriers, which have superseded armoured cars.

Wireless sets: All patterns, mainly of Australian design for all services.

Miscellaneous items: Assault boats, pontoons, and other bridging equipment, and a range of engineers' stores running into several hundred separate items.

All this means a magnificent effort; and we must always remember that Australia has only two-thirds the population of Canada, and about one-half our natural wealth.

I know I speak for the whole of the people of Canada when I pay my profound tribute of praise to this great dominion. I heartily congratulate its gallant people, but I can assure them that, although Canada may have been slow in starting, we will be in strong at the finish.

If Australia can be frank about their contribution, as they have been, there is no reason why Canada should not be; and if they make public their figures, I am not prepared at this time to accept the conventional answer of the Prime Minister that disclosure of Canada's contribution in terms of units will give comfort to the enemy. That can be only if Canada's contribution is as small as some people in this country are now beginning to suspect. Moreover, if our contribution had been what it should have been, there would certainly then have been no room for

rejoicing in Germany. But however unpalatable the truth of our unpreparedness may be, let us have the truth. If Australia has made a good beginning and we a bad one, let us say to Australia: "To-day we are lagging behind you, but to-morrow we will be racing you to the post. We are now on our way."

The Prime Minister took great pains to prove that his place, as Prime Minister of Canada, was in Canada and not in England at any time. Our friend, the Hon. W. D. Herridge, and others, must have been greatly gratified to have so much attention paid to his suggestions that the Prime Minister should go to England and see at first-hand for himself the whole position and the necessities of the situation.

The Prime Minister's remarks constituted at least an indirect rebuke to Mr. Menzies, the Australian Prime Minister, who is now in London, and who stated in a broadcast on his arrival there that he had gone to England to secure information and first-hand knowledge and to endeavour to coordinate the war effort of Australia and Great Britain, which it had not been possible to do without direct communication.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am sure my hon. friend does not wish to misrepresent me or what I said. My references were entirely to the establishment of a war council in England at the present time, not to a visit to England at any time. My hon. friend says "at any time." I made no such statement. I said there were times when it would be appropriate to go, but I did not think this was the time to establish an imperial war council.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Possibly I was wrong, but I will come to that again a little later; I intend to deal with it quite fully.

If the methods of communication described by the Prime Minister between the British government and the Canadian government are so satisfactory, and if the high commissioner in London is acting with such great capacity, why has it been necessary for five ministers of this government to go overseas between November of 1939 and this date? That is the query I put to the Prime Minister.

Early in the war the Minister of Mines and Resources (Mr. Crerar) went overseas, presumably to sell our wheat surplus. We have never been told the result of his operations. If they had been successful I am sure we should have heard of them.

Next to go was the late Minister of National Defence, who early last session made his report. He went definitely, I should say, for the purpose of first-hand consultation. The