

*Labour Crisis in Aircraft Industry*

hand. These will be my closing words and it is perhaps appropriate that they should come from an editorial which appeared in the *Toronto Globe and Mail* of February 21, 1959, in which it is stated:

The Prime Minister's judgment on the Arrow and its future must as we have said be accepted.

I hope that that judgment can even now be reconsidered. The editorial continues:

The fact remains, however, that the government has no program or policy by which to put anything in its place. It is on this fact, we believe, that the government's decision—and the consequences thereof—must ultimately be judged.

We, Mr. Speaker, are quite happy to judge it on that consideration and when it is judged on that consideration I am certain it will be condemned by the people of this country.

**Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, at the expense of reiteration I refer to the fact that the motion before the house is asking authority to move the adjournment of the house for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance involving mass layoffs and the threatened disintegration of the aircraft industry in Canadian defence production. Speaking on behalf of the government this afternoon, instead of relying on the technicalities of the rules which no doubt would have given rise to considerable argument, I stated that we welcomed the opportunity for the discussion in order to clarify many of those things which in the course of the last two or three days have been encumbered by misrepresentations and conclusions not warranted by the facts.

I sat here this afternoon and listened with interest to the speakers who have participated in the discussion on behalf of the opposition. While in general they have indulged in continuing criticism it is interesting to observe that when they had the opportunity of offering suggestions as to what might have been done in regard to this question none was forthcoming—

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** We are now hearing, Mr. Speaker, the same old chorus, the same old songsters singing the same old song. They sing it because they had nothing to present but criticism. Hon. gentlemen opposite found themselves in rather a difficult position. The allies of recent date of economic and social planning found themselves separated this afternoon when even the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Pearson) found himself unable to accept some of the statements made by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Argue) in respect of the question of United States dominance of Canada.

I intend simply to remove immediately one or two misapprehensions concerning matters which I feel should be clarified. This afternoon we listened with interest to the hon. member for Assiniboia dealing with the question respecting the cancellation of this contract. As I listened to the hon. gentleman I wondered if my recollection of his former words was correct and so I looked back and found an interesting statement attributed to that hon. gentleman at page 1062 of *Hansard* of November 13, 1957, when he directed a question of some interest to me in the following language:

Has the attention of the Prime Minister been drawn to the reported statement of Lieutenant General Simonds that if the \$300 million wasted on that dead duck the CF-105 had been used to stockpile Canadian wheat in Europe it would have been spent to much greater advantage?

The voice of November 1957, is a different voice from that of February 23, 1959. The hon. gentleman then went on to say:

Has the Prime Minister considered a substantial reduction in current military expenditures and would he consider using any moneys thus saved to stockpile wheat in Europe, or otherwise to give economic assistance to the free nations?

Mr. Speaker, to which voice shall we listen? Which is the voice of authority, the one in 1957 when it described the CF-105 as a dead duck, or the voice of today?

As I listened to my hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition I observed that he too found himself in some difficulties today. He had expressed a different point of view at other times. I was not quite able to follow him today as to whether he is for or against the CF-105 being continued. He spoke on both sides of that question; whereas, only a few months ago in a statement he made at Edmonton, Alberta, as reported in the *Edmonton Journal* of October 3, 1958, he said:

We decided when in office two and one-half years ago to go ahead with the CF-105 and review it year by year in the light of developments.

Then, he went on to say this:

The Liberal government had reviewed its decision every six months. Had the Liberals been in office when the first ICBM was fired Mr. Pearson said, "this would have been a major factor in possible revision of our decision."

Then, he went on to say:

The Conservative government should have cancelled the Arrow production order this fall instead of waiting until next spring. How much is going to be spent on the Arrow between now and then?

**Mr. Pearson:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, this particular quotation was put on the record once before by my hon. friend. It will be found on page 56 of *Hansard* of January 19. I rose at that time and denied it. I said I had the text of what I said,