

270227

boys. I know of people in my city who bought socks for the soldiers. I am not going to condemn the government because there was not a sufficient supply of this, that or the other thing in the first days of enlistment. We all know that uniforms were not ready, but the government got the uniforms ready as quickly as they could. I am not going to make any great point about that.

Mr. ROGERS: But my hon. friend is making a point.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I am saying that the statement that they were fully equipped is not fully true, but was probably approximately correct. The Prime Minister went on to say that they were fully equipped. I know that during the election a controversy arose over this question of military equipment and for a time allegations and recriminations passed on the public platform between the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Rogers) and the then leader of the opposition in connection with the question of deficient equipment. I am going to call as a witness in my behalf the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ralston). He is an old soldier. He is a man who has a sense of responsibility in connection with the position he now occupies. He made a speech on behalf of the Minister of National Defence in the city of Kingston, on March 8. On this very question of equipment, weeks after the Prime Minister had made, on February 21, the declaration to which I have alluded, that all had left Canada fully equipped, what did the Minister of Finance say at Kingston? I am not going to quote his very words; they are a matter of record; but this is how I epitomize what he said, endeavouring to do so honestly and faithfully. He said: "The division went overseas without motor equipment." Surely in this age motor equipment is necessary, and without that equipment no one can truthfully say that they were fully equipped.

Mr. RALSTON: Does my hon. friend think it is quite fair for him to paraphrase the statement—to call a witness and put his own words into the mouth of the witness? Would he mind reading the statement?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The Minister of Finance is an old lawyer—well, I will say an experienced counsel; for that sounds more dignified. I think I can produce the words of the minister at Kingston. At all events, this is my understanding of what he said, and he can deny it if he likes.

He said, first, "The division went overseas without motor transport. It is hoped to have carriers ready and sent to England in time to go with the division to France."

[Mr. R. B. Hanson (York-Sunbury).]

Two: Bren gun carriers. Where have we heard about that before? "The Bren gun carriers will be supplied to the division by the British government, Canada making replacements later on." And he did not tell us when that would be.

Mr. BROOKS: After the war is over.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Three: "Chassis for field ambulances were sent over with the troops, and the United Kingdom is putting on bodies to make them uniform in design with the British ambulances." Four: "In the matter of artillery, the division was supplied with 18-pounder guns." Nobody in the world is using 18-pounder guns to-day. None of the units in England is using them.

Mr. ROGERS: There are 18-pounder guns at the front in France to-day, and ammunition for 18-pounder guns is being made in the United Kingdom and Canada to-day.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Well, all right; I am not a military man; but my information is that they should be equipped with 25-pounder guns; and the Minister of Finance said this: "In the matter of artillery, the division was supplied with 18-pounder guns, but these will be replaced later by the more modern 25-pounder guns."

Mr. ROGERS: Quite so. That does not exclude the other statement.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I think I am right in what I was about to say. The Minister of National Defence is just a little bit too quick, I suggest, in rising in his place and protesting.

Mr. ROGERS: Mr. Speaker, I am just going to say this: I am interested in maintaining accuracy and in preventing misinformation.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): My understanding is that 18-pounder guns are obsolete. I may be wrong, but I should like to have a better witness on that point than the Minister of National Defence himself. At the moment I am summoning to my aid his colleague the Minister of Finance.

Five: "The division took with it Lewis machine guns, fifty to a battalion, but these are to be replaced later on by the more modern Bren guns." Obsolete equipment again!

Mr. RALSTON: Oh no, no. Lewis guns are not obsolete.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Well, pretty nearly so. I believe they are being discarded as fast as they can be replaced by Bren guns.

270228 41

Mr. RALSTON: I thought the hon. gentleman was not a military man.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Six: "Anti-tank rifles and anti-tank guns were not available for the division. They are being supplied in Britain." Seven: "Wireless equipment was not available. Some will be supplied here, some in England."

What about rifles? I understand that this division was equipped with reconditioned rifles, and that they will be discarded just as soon as new rifles can be produced.

What about gas masks? A disturbing suggestion has been made to me. I put it in the form of an inquiry. I understand that immediately before or after the beginning of the war the department arranged for the manufacture of 250,000 gas masks based on the theory that Germany would be using the same kind of gas in this war as she used in the last, but that information has come that this type of gas mask will not be useful for the purpose for which it is intended, and the whole supply has had to be scrapped except such as can be used for demonstration purposes. I do not vouch for the truth of this statement, but I ask the government to give attention to it; I have the right to put it before them.

Mr. ROGERS: If my hon. friend will permit me, does he want that statement to go out in its present form?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I am asking a question. I have the right to do so, and the minister has no right to interrupt me.

Mr. ROGERS: I will answer the question, if my hon. friend will permit me. Is it a question?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Yes, it is.

Mr. ROGERS: Well, I will answer it. The statement is incorrect.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I am asking the minister to give consideration to this matter. He will find that there is a great deal more to it than he is willing to admit at this moment.

Mr. ROGERS: The statement is incorrect.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): All right. What about recruiting for these suggested divisions or other units, or for any? Surely the administration is not proud of its record on recruiting. Apparently there has been no plan. If there is, it has not been divulged to the public. I say to the Prime Minister and to the Minister of National Defence that there are thousands of young men in Canada who want to enlist, and the major part of the

time there is no recruiting station for them to go to, no opportunity to enlist. In New Brunswick opportunities of enlistment have been extremely limited. I should like to page the young lady writer in the *Toronto Globe* who made a personal investigation and found that, last week, in the great city of Toronto, there were available places for fifty-three men. Apparently the government does not want young men to enlist for the front. I do not believe the Canadian people are satisfied with that attitude. If hon. gentlemen opposite doubt what I have said, let them read the leading articles in the great public newspapers of this country. The writers are, surely, pretty well informed; they do not rush into print with statements for which there is no foundation.

I say this, on my responsibility as a member of this house, that the people of Canada are alarmed at the lack of plan, the lack of preparation, the lack of action on the part of the administration. It seems to have taken serious reverses to the allied arms in an important theatre of war to shock the Canadian people into a realization that Canada is at war at all, and it has taken the same series of reverses to shock this government into action. Because the Canadian people are shocked they are now demanding that the inertness—shall I say complacency?—of this administration with respect to Canada's war effort shall be immediately ended. Britain and her gallant allies are fighting for their very existence, for our existence, for the liberty and the Christian civilization of us all, and Canada is not at their side. Is not that a sad thing, that at this time in our national history Canada is not there?

Let us end all this. Let us put into action the forces of the whole nation in men, in treasure, and all our resources. Let us pull our full weight in this great enterprise. I tell the Prime Minister and the government that no halfway measure will satisfy either our self-respect or the great mass of public opinion in this country which is calling for action.

I call upon the Prime Minister, when he replies this afternoon, to tell the nation what the government has done and what it proposes to do, and if that is not enough the people of the country will rise up in righteous indignation and demand a complete change. This happened in England and it can happen in Canada. The Canadian people will demand, over and above everything else, intelligent and informed leadership, intelligent and immediate action. If the Prime Minister will not give this, then somebody else will.