

I am hopeful that aircraft production in Canada will reach the point suggested, and higher too. Like every other new industry, it has to grope its way through all difficulties; it has to go through the morass of lack of engineering data, lack of designing data, lack of many of the things we cannot make in Canada and have never made. It could not be expected that we would have a greater effort, and yet the minister promised such an effort. I think he was too optimistic. That is a charitable view to take and I will leave it at that.

We have not come very close to fulfilling expectations, and I suggest to the minister that this is the sort of thing to which the Canadian people have been objecting. Our expectations are raised and disillusionment is painful. I do not know what the facts are about production, but one newspaper states that actual deliveries in January were 60 per cent of the estimate, and most of the production is that of small primary trainers. Apparently they have been able to produce these with considerable facility. I should like the minister to tell us exactly, if he did not tell us the other day in plain terms, just what the facts are, and I suggest that vituperation and bitterness will not produce planes, but that a plain unvarnished statement of facts, without vituperation and bitterness, will help the house and the country to reach conclusions on policy and will redound to the credit of the minister.

The minister has admitted that the manufacturers were requested by the acting minister to submit recommendations as to what should be done with the Avro-Anson programme. He has read the letter submitted by the manufacturers, in which they made five recommendations, and the fact is that five important recommendations were made by the manufacturers themselves and, it is said, ignored by the minister. The minister agrees with me. He ignored their recommendations. Why did he ignore those recommendations? Were they ineffective? Were they irresponsible recommendations? Were they such that they should be ignored?

Then, the minister admitted that he personally requested the manufacturing firms to answer three questions. He admits that the questions as I stated them were exactly as asked, but he did not tell us—and I suggest that this is a significant omission—what the joint reply of the firms was. I invite him to add their reply to the record. I have already stated—I stated it in the statement I gave the press and I will not repeat it—what I believed their reply was, namely, their reiteration of the basic theme of complaint against

Federal Aircraft, that there can be no guarantee of performance, and the several matters to which I have referred.

The minister has neither confirmed nor denied the statement. To my amazement, he has not given any reasons or explanations why he has refused to follow the unanimous recommendations of the manufacturers. In my view—and I say this in all charity—he failed to take the Canadian public into his confidence, and I invite him to do so while there is still time.

In conclusion, I just desire to say that we on this side have a duty to perform to the Canadian people, and we shall not be intimidated from making criticism of the government's effort. I repudiate entirely the suggestion of sabotage, and that such criticism is designed to impair production. I repudiate these suggestions on the part of the minister. The minister said that the department was being disorganized by such criticisms. We have made no criticism of the department as such, or of the executives. In fact, I have always defended the executives. I did so the other day. What we have criticized is the set-up which the minister launched in July, 1940, and which, by the unanimous consent of those who know best, namely, the aircraft industry itself, has failed to perform the functions for which it was intended.

Before I take my seat I should like to ask the Minister of Munitions and Supply if he will table at the earliest possible moment:

(a) A copy of all contracts between the government and Federal Aircraft Limited;

(b) A copy of all contracts between the government and/or Federal Aircraft Limited and the manufacturers of Avro-Anson planes;

(c) A copy of all letters, telegrams, memoranda, or other documents exchanged between the government and Federal Aircraft Limited and/or any official thereof, with reference to the speeding up of production, the personnel of Federal Aircraft Limited, the status of Federal Aircraft Limited, and associated matters;

(d) A copy of all letters, telegrams, memoranda, or other documents exchanged between the government and/or Federal Aircraft Limited and/or any official thereof and any manufacturer or manufacturers of Avro-Anson planes or parts thereof relating to the speeding up of production, the status of Federal Aircraft Limited, and associated matters.

I have finished with what I had to say on this matter. I am sorry the debate took the turn it did. I do not think it was necessary or desirable. A newspaper or a public citizen of this country, making statements based upon