

Supply—Defence Production

Kingdom more of the purchases that it was unable to make in Canada and in that way assist the United Kingdom with its dollar problem in order that it might in turn purchase more of our products in this country.

Hon. members will see by looking in the annual report, on the pages I have mentioned, that the net value of defence orders placed in the United States by this department in the period from April 1, 1951, to December 31, 1955, a period of 4½ years, aggregated \$545,340,000, and the value of actual expenditures on defence orders placed in the United States by the department was \$572,219,000.

I turn now to the purchases in the United Kingdom. In the same period the net value of Canadian defence orders placed in the United Kingdom by this department was \$163,490,000, and the value of expenditures on Canadian government defence orders placed in the United Kingdom by this department was \$126,441,000. It was a very small percentage indeed of the total of purchases made in the United States.

Now, I come to two matters in concluding these remarks, Mr. Chairman. First, I refer to the basis of purchases. The annual report of the department contains this sentence on page 24:

With the increase in Canada's industrial defence potential it has been possible to purchase more goods in Canada, to increase the number of cases in which contracts are placed on the basis of competitive tender, and to move from cost plus to target price or negotiated firm price contracts in those fields in which Canadian firms have gained more operating experience.

Now, that is an interesting statement, Mr. Chairman, and we shall certainly wish to have much more elaborate information on the subject. Therefore, I ask that we be given detailed information on the number and value and proportion out of the total of contracts placed on competitive tender and the numbers and amounts and percentages of those placed on a cost plus basis, or a target price basis, or negotiated firm price basis.

Now, sir, I come in conclusion to one other matter. I referred already to the fact that the minister heads two departments and that 14 crown corporations report to him. He has many other burdens as well, including that of Acting Prime Minister at the present time. In this house on June 14 I referred to a matter which relates to the fact that the minister is one of the executors of the estate of the late Sir James Dunn. My remarks are to be found at pages 5031 and 5032 of *Hansard*.

Mr. Howe (Port Arthur): I made comment on that in the newspapers.

Mr. Fleming: In restrained and temperate terms I referred in the house to that subject and I dealt with it strictly on the basis of

[Mr. Fleming.]

principle. I want to make it quite clear, Mr. Chairman, that it was not a personal matter on my part. I spoke for Her Majesty's loyal opposition. I dealt with the matter as a question of principle. There was nothing personal as relates to the minister himself. Although the debate went on for some time the minister did not choose to enter it, but on the following day he made a statement to the press outside the house in which he did not deal with the principle that I had raised, but directed at myself aspersions and defamatory statements. I hope that the two weeks have been a sufficient cooling-off period.

Mr. Howe (Port Arthur): My hon. friend speaks about the remarks made outside the house?

Mr. Fleming: I ask the minister to take back what he said about me.

Mr. Sinclair: I thought it was an accurate statement of fact.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall the item carry?

Mr. Fleming: I ask the minister to take back those personal remarks.

Mr. Howe (Port Arthur): I said nothing that is unparliamentary or anything else. As I remember my statement—would you like me to repeat it?

Mr. Fleming: No.

Mr. Howe (Port Arthur): I was asked quite casually by a reporter what I was going to do about your remarks and—

Mr. Fleming: That is not the part I refer to.

Mr. Howe (Port Arthur): What is the part?

Mr. Fleming: The personal remarks the minister made about me. He is quite entitled, of course, to deal with the subject. I am not finding fault with what the minister says about that at all. The minister is perfectly at liberty to deal with the subject of his own plans in relation to the executorship or to anything like that. What I refer to are the personal remarks that he directed toward me. They were defamatory remarks, and I ask that those remarks be taken back.

Mr. Howe (Port Arthur): Mr. Chairman, as I remember what I said, I said that of the 263 members of the House of Commons the hon. member is the last one I would ask to instruct me on ethics. Does my hon. friend object to that?

Mr. Fleming: Yes.

Mr. Howe (Port Arthur): Who else of the 263 would he pick out to succeed himself?

Mr. Fleming: This is not such a funny matter. When remarks like these are made