

Supply—Defence Production

history of this country. I admit that immediately. I admit also that in many ways and at many times the minister has done a job which has brought great credit to himself and great benefit to Canada. But that has not necessarily made him immune from criticism nor is the minister, because he has a satisfactory record in some respects, necessarily perfect in all respects.

I think as the years have gone by the hon. and venerable gentleman has come perhaps to have great confidence in himself, but that is a confidence which some of us do not always share. I underline the word "always" because I think we should be left in this house—

Mr. Sinclair: Even the gallery does not like it.

An hon. Member: One of your playmates.

An hon. Member: Calling for mother.

An hon. Member: Probably a taxpayer.

An hon. Member: A taxpayer crying protest.

Mr. Hamilton (Notre Dame de Grace): Someone has pointed out that may very well be a taxpayer crying in protest, or it may be a visiting member of the Port Arthur Liberal association.

An hon. Member: The Canadian public.

Mr. Hamilton (Notre Dame de Grace): No matter what the minister thinks I believe we on this side should be privileged to examine his actions, to go into them with some care, to question him about them if we do not agree, and to criticize him on occasion. That seems to be the major point of difference between the Minister of Defence Production and ourselves. He objects to criticism of any sort.

Returning to the argument which I was making before, and which seemed to cause the minister some concern, the argument is that if anyone will take the areas of economic interest which have come to the minister as executor of the Dunn estate and compare those areas of specific economic and business interests with the suppliers of this federal government, from whom the Minister of National Defence is purchasing supplies, equipment and services, they will find that there is a close correlation between these two fields. In the matter of two or three minutes between the time I came into this house with the volumes of these public accounts—and I went to my office to get them—and the time I got up to speak, I was able to find one of those areas of conflict, and it is a comparatively small one, just over \$100,000. Incidentally I was also able to get the minister to contradict himself in the first few minutes

of his speech, but that was a by-product and has nothing to do with this particular argument.

As long as those areas of conflict continue—and they will continue as long as the minister holds this executorship—I do not think that we can have the same confidence in his ministerial decisions.

Mr. Howe (Port Arthur): Don't worry about that, smart boy. I don't care whether or not you have confidence.

Mr. Hamilton (Notre Dame de Grace): Mr. Chairman, it might be a good idea to remind the minister of one of the basic principles of debate in this house, which is that all remarks are directed to the Chair. I remember that on a previous occasion he called the Speaker of this house "junior"; now he is calling you a smart boy.

Mr. Sinclair: Not to the Chair in committee, but to the Speaker of the house.

Mr. Fulton: Certainly in committee.

Mr. Hamilton (Notre Dame de Grace): I enjoy these interruptions. They show how little the members of the cabinet know about the rules of the house.

Mr. Howe (Port Arthur): I will say that this is the most intelligent speech we have had on this subject from the other side.

Mr. Hamilton (Notre Dame de Grace): This afternoon the senior member for Halifax, had I taken his words as they were intended to impress me and had I no other knowledge of the subject, would have left me with the feeling that the minister was almost a ghost in connection with the executorship of this estate. He had chosen to renounce all his rights, he had chosen to renounce his control over the details of the administration of the estate, and he was only to come in at the very end as a sort of guiding light or spiritual adviser to the executors after everything else had been taken care of.

I must say that the arguments which have been made since that time, which have been from a legal point of view, have satisfied me of the very great responsibilities of the minister in connection with this estate and his obligation to carry out those responsibilities by a very active connection with the detailed administration of the estate. I know he has a lawyer's opinion that indicates that he does not need to follow through on these matters, but I suggest to you that we would not even have lawyers if all of them were always in agreement. I wonder how much trust or confidence can be placed in this one opinion which, as far as I know, has not actually been read into the records of this house, nor has the source itself been defined.