

pany at Sydney is occupied largely with British orders. There is no industrialization of the maritime provinces or marshalling of our efforts there. I ask my new friend from Nova Scotia—

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Kingston.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): —from Kingston; I am afraid I never can dissociate him from the bluenose province, and I do not think he desires to be dissociated, either—to give an ear to this plea and to see if we cannot have something done. We have facilities down there. I have in mind a little town not far from the New Brunswick border; I shall not name it. Why are the facilities there not being utilized? Why are there no new developments in the maritime provinces? I want to say this: if you are going to centralize everything in central Canada, as has been the custom for decades, do you think the people of the maritime provinces are going to tolerate that sort of thing? They will not. They are just as loyal as and perhaps more loyal than the people in the central provinces. I would make the same reference to people in the other parts of Canada—in the west. Things can be done out there; they can be done in the maritime provinces; let us have them done. One hears so much talk—and if one judges by what appeared in the newspapers yesterday morning we are going to hear more to the same effect when the dominion-provincial conference is held—about central Canada paying the bill. Well, I am not one of those who wants to create dissension in the country. I believe in Canada. We are all making a contribution. But in our war effort, not merely as regards the supplies, but in respect of equipment, let us really distribute it. It is up to the Minister of Munitions and Supply to see that something is done in this direction: he seems to forget that he ever lived down there. I do not think I need say more on this point at the present time; we will wait until we hear what the reports are.

Now I wish to devote a little time to the consideration of a speech made in the city of Ottawa on October 23 last by the chief of the general staff, Major-General Crerar. It is a rather unusual thing for a chief of the general staff to get up in any public body and make a speech about a matter which is or may become the subject of political discussion in this country. I am not going to take exception to General Crerar's speaking on this matter, but I should like to know whether the speech was inspired by the Department of National Defence, and I ask the minister to say whether it was or not.

The copy of the speech which I have under my hand bears all the earmarks of having been issued by the department itself, and it may therefore be considered to be a speech on behalf of the minister, because the copy I have was issued from the press liaison office of the Department of National Defence, Ottawa.

I have read that speech very carefully, and this is what I believe it to be: The speech has served as an apologia for and defence of the government's war effort, particularly in respect of the thirty day training scheme—and I use the word apologia in its classical sense. It is a defence of the government's war effort and particularly of the thirty-day scheme. And what is the apologia? The gist of it was that the effort was limited because of lack of preparedness, lack of equipment, lack of the implements of war. That is the story in a nutshell, if you read that speech carefully.

On page 8 of the speech General Crerar states:

The major issue confronting Canada in particular and North America in general is to win this war in Europe and so to prevent any possibility of this continent finding itself in a definitely isolated and exposed situation.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with every word that General Crerar has said in that regard. It is fundamental and it is something I have iterated and reiterated from the very beginning; and I say further, with him, that the question of home defence will follow. Then he draws certain lessons. I am not hoping to cover the whole scope of his speech, but he draws two lessons from our experiences to date. The first appears on pages 8 and 9 of the speech, and it is this: That Canadian forces must be fully provided with mechanized power, including modern artillery, armoured fighting vehicles, and ample assistance for close support aircraft. That of course is fundamental and quite sound. The second lesson he derives from the history of the war so far is this: Reliance on static defence is inviting defeat. The failure of the allies in the field has been due to the lack of attacking power. That is what he says, and to quote from page 9:

To take the offensive, military forces must be highly trained, as well as powerfully armed, and, furthermore, trained to cooperate closely with the air force.

On page 10 he says we must concentrate on two things:

1. Utilization to the full of all the skill, ingenuity and facilities we now possess "to advance the fundamental training of all ranks now in our army in the science and art of their profession."