

responsibilities. I had a feeling of personal pride in the course that we took; for I had urged in this house, in the face of considerable opposition, that Canada must exercise freedom of choice in the supreme issue of peace or war and I was confident that she could always be trusted to face each issue as it arose in the interests of the Canadian people. I was not disappointed in that faith.

I am supremely confident that after this war is over there will be a great surge of truly Canadian sentiment in this country, and that the prophecy of Sir Wilfrid Laurier that this century belongs to Canada will ultimately be fulfilled. I am jealous of the honour of Canada as a nation. When this war is over I would not want anyone to be able to say that Canada had entered the war as a nation but had failed in her national duty; that she had promised her utmost aid to Great Britain but had failed to give it. There must be no blemish upon our national honour. It is our solemn and sacred national duty to carry out the pledge contained in the speech from the throne. Therefore, as a Canadian, devoutly proud of my country, I pledge my utmost support toward a maximum Canadian war effort in aid of Great Britain in her heroic and magnificent struggle for the cause of civilization.

Mr. GEORGE S. WHITE (Hastings-Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, since the last time I appeared in this house I have been serving as adjutant of the second battalion of the Hastings and Prince Edward regiment, having enlisted on June 29. Notwithstanding what has been said to the contrary, I did not receive my commission from this government. I received my commission in August, 1930, and since that date I have been actively connected with the Hastings and Prince Edward regiment. I have held my present rank for over five years and was adjutant of the battalion long before the war. I trust hon. members will pardon me for making these personal remarks, but I do so in order that no one in this house will think I have received one of these lightning promotions of which we hear from time to time.

At the time of the formation of our battalion there were two officers at headquarters—the colonel and myself. Since July 1, I have seen our unit expand until at the present time there are over 900 all ranks, without taking into account those who have recently been attached to the unit on paper only from the training centres. During this period I have observed many things first-hand of which the public are entirely ignorant or in connection with which they have been misinformed. I should like to assure the Min-

[Mr. Thorson.]

ister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) that while some of my remarks may be critical, I offer them in the most friendly manner as constructive criticism. I also hope to be able to offer to him and the government some suggestions which may tend to overcome many of the objectionable things which are now inflicted upon our military forces.

I had looked forward with much interest to the address of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) which he delivered yesterday because I had hoped to learn more of our war aims, but I was disappointed. As a review of historical events, both ancient and modern, his speech was splendid, but that is not what the people of Canada are demanding to-day. The people want to be told in plain, simple language the military objectives of this government. They want to know by what plans the government aims to arrive at these objectives. The time has long passed for flowery adjectives and fervent statements of loyalty. Surely it can be taken for granted that every hon. member is a loyal British subject. It should not be necessary for them to try to outdo each other in allegations of extreme loyalty. Let the actions of hon. members speak for themselves. The people of this dominion are quite able to judge whether or not this government is doing all that it should in the prosecution of the war.

Let this government give the public the true facts of our war effort without this continual window-dressing. The Prime Minister is a lawyer, but he had a very poor case to present in his speech yesterday. Like a skilful lawyer addressing a jury, he skated round his subject very carefully. He used eloquent language and made obscure references to the real points of the case. He criticized the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) at some length for his use of the words "lull" and "soothe". Yet the Prime Minister in referring to the manufacture of planes in Canada stated that the output had been increased two or three hundred per cent. This sounds marvellous, but how much better it would have been if the Prime Minister had said that in July or August of this year the output of planes was two, four or five planes, or whatever the correct figure is, and then made the comparison with the output in September or October of this year.

The Prime Minister paid a tribute to the non-permanent units, but he failed to give any outline of the future of these units. The rumour persists at the present time that these units are to be demobilized. Their training period will be ended this month. He also