

Defence Production Act

Third, I should like to quote the minister's words from page 5377 of *Hansard*, and this touches one:

Industry is familiar with these controls. It has been working under them for 16 years, and as far as I know it is quite happy to work under them indefinitely. Of all the complaints that have been heard since this debate started I have not heard one single complaint from the people affected, namely, the people who are actually doing the defence production work in this country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask you; would anybody in his right senses who is under the thumb of the minister and who is producing for the minister for one minute dare to complain to the all-powerful Minister of Defence Production? That is the kind of argument that has been advanced in these speeches which have been delivered from the government side of the house. In the following paragraph the minister is shown as saying:

We have seen many legitimate objections—

The minister later said that what he had said was:

We have seen any legitimate objections to the bill drowned in a torrent of exaggeration.

The subtraction of the letter "m" did not help the minister a bit because, by inference at least, he admits that there are some objections. At page 5379 and again at page 5380 of *Hansard* we hear this from the minister:

After we had got involved for \$30 or \$40 million it was quite obvious that the management of that day was not likely to produce what we required. The top management of A.V. Roe was resident in England. The men on the job just did not have the experience necessary to carry out the work, and that became obvious to all concerned.

The minister said he shuddered to think of the problems of development. As a taxpayer of this country I shudder to think that the Minister of Defence Production can spend \$30 or \$40 million on one project before he finds out that the management of that project is inefficient. I shudder.

One of the most masterful exhibitions of smug, self-satisfied complacency that I have ever heard in any form is that beautiful phrase at the end of the minister's speech:

I am working on the side of the angels.

I wonder if the minister has forgotten the full text from which he clipped that little gem. I wonder if he has forgotten that it came from a speech delivered at the Oxford diocesan conference in 1864. Just to remind the minister I propose to place the full quotation on the record in order to complete his own quotation. It is:

What is the question now placed before society with the glib assurance which to me is most astonishing? That question is this: Is man an [Mr. Mitchell (London).]

ape or an angel? I, my lord, I am on the side of the angels. I repudiate with indignation and abhorrence these new-fangled theories.

If there ever was a new-fangled theory introduced into this house, the one which is sponsored by the Prime Minister in the interests of the Minister of Defence Production is it. We can come to only one conclusion, that the Minister of Defence Production is not the angel he claims to be. Speaking of angels—and they are interesting people to talk about—I wonder also if the Minister of Defence Production in his inquiry into the attributes and uses to which angels may be put has ever run across this quotation which I am sure he will recognize:

But man, proud man,
Drest in a little brief authority,
Most ignorant of what he's most assured,
His glassy essence, like an angry ape,
Plays such fantastic tricks before high heaven
As make the angels weep.

We make the angels weep. I quote once again from page 5379 of *Hansard*:

I may say that industry co-operated to the full, and, as I said before, I have never known Canadian industry to see the Department of Defence Production in a jam without being willing to do whatever was needed to make their contribution to solving the dilemma.

And from page 5378:

An hon. member asks why it is necessary to have these powers, since we have a good munitions industry in this country. I say "Amen" to that. No country in the world has a stronger and more devoted munitions industry than Canada.

Yet in almost the same breath, shortly after these two statements in which he gives the munitions industry credit for a job well done, the minister comes out and says that without the Defence Production Act behind him he certainly would not have been able to deal with a situation of that kind.

We have heard many illustrations of the blowing of hot and cold air by the same person at the same time in this house, but that is the pay-off. Here we have the minister praising industry in one breath and then saying that he just cannot get along without full powers, without this thumb right on top of industry, defence or otherwise.

Once again, ape or angel, I do not know which is which on which side of the house, but if one is an angel the other is an ape. I can only say that it is not we who are producing the new-fangled theories referred to in the quotation from the Oxford diocesan conference. In conclusion I repeat that we on this side weep lest we lose democracy.

Mr. Speaker: In his introductory remarks the hon. member for London (Mr. Mitchell) referred to Liberal lawyers who had taken part in debate as speaking with their tongues in their cheeks. I did not want to intervene