

air force in Canada, and by those departments in Great Britain that have entrusted their business to us.

I am the last man in the world who should answer the argument my hon. friend has made with regard to dividing the work. I do not think it is a good thing to do; but if others believe it is, I certainly will not stand in their way.

Mr. DIFENBAKER: I believe the discussion we have heard during the past couple of days with regard to aircraft has been most interesting and illuminating. After recovering from some of the annoyances of a few days ago, the discussion to-day has been carried on in a manner that must have been helpful to the minister, and has been revealing to us.

The minister has frankly admitted that the promises made in July last, and the anticipated deliveries then expected, as well as the promises made in November and December, have not resulted in the fulfilment of his expectations. Various suggestions have been made, and one of them is that, realizing as we all do the tremendous responsibilities on the minister, and without any suggestion or any inference against him, the department should be divided, with a view to securing the fulfilment of expectations with regard to the numbers of planes to be delivered.

We have endeavoured to secure information and, speaking on behalf of the official opposition, we should like to have tabled before parliament the entire report made by Mr. H. R. MacMillan, except such matters as would in any way be of assistance to the enemy.

Mr. HOWE: It is in to-day's *Votes and Proceedings*.

Mr. DIFENBAKER: While a portion of it is in to-day's *Votes and Proceedings*, there remains another portion which does not appear. I realize it is difficult to decide what parts would or would not be beneficial to the enemy. The minister has told us that in so far as the production of aeroplanes is concerned, industry has fallen down. He has said that it is a mushroom industry and that apparently it lacks coordination. He mentioned in particular the situation in so far as the Boeing aircraft company is concerned.

I have a suggestion to make at this time, arising out of the statement with regard to the division of responsibility in the United Kingdom. I suggest that, with a view to preventing the possibility of failures such as have occurred in the last six months in the matter of aircraft production, we have set up at this time a committee composed of representatives of the aircraft industry in

Canada, and that we get in touch with the Right Hon. R. B. Bennett, acquainted as he is with requirements in Great Britain, and experienced as he must be in consequence of the assistance he has given Lord Beaverbrook, and have him come to Canada and head a committee or, if you like, a commission, to investigate the whole situation with regard to the failure of our aircraft production, to the end that further failures will not have to be admitted in this chamber.

So far as the official opposition is concerned, our attitude is not one of offering unfair criticism. We believe that as an opposition we have the right and the duty to place before parliament and Canada the facts in connection with what we believe is not being done in the interests of this country. Apathetic acceptance of conditions will not win this war. The minister has said that we have not been able to live up to our expectations, that things have not turned out as we expected they would. That is not good enough. To-day we must have planes, not promises. We must have planes, not plans for the future. We must have action from this department and not just adjectives describing the perfection of the performance.

Our position is similar to that adopted in Great Britain in 1915 and 1916. The other day the minister spoke in critical terms of the *Financial Post* and referred to that paper as a saboteur. Twenty-five years ago I heard from the gallery of the British House of Commons the same criticism levelled against the *London Times*. At that time it was taking an attitude similar to that taken by the financial and other papers of Canada to-day. Our newspapers are asking for action instead of promises and excuses. As the hon. member for Weyburn (Mr. Douglas) stated a little while ago, Lord Northcliffe was maligned, condemned and pointed out as a traitor because he condemned what he believed was wrong, because he insisted upon action.

We, as the official opposition, represent a large portion of public opinion in this dominion. We represent the majority of the men who are in the armed forces of this country. We owe a duty to those whom we represent to place before parliament the viewpoints that we wish to express. I do not believe in criticism just for the sake of criticism, especially at this time of national need. I am not, nor are the members of this group, concerned with political platforms. The attitude of the Conservative party is to endeavour to assist and cooperate with the government. We will criticize where we believe criticism is due, but we will approve when we believe credit is due. We realize the