

*Labour Crisis in Aircraft Industry*

of defence, presumably against bombers had been developed much earlier than had been expected.

It is difficult to understand how the threat from manned bombers could have diminished. It has, of course, been some time since those of us on this side of the house who are interested in these matters have had access to the sources which the government uses as a means of reaching its decisions, but I am sure from the information we have and from the information we can obtain from technical sources, magazines and other places, that the present inventory of Russian bombers is greater today than at any time in history. If the Prime Minister had said that it was a continuing threat, and one which remained at the present time at least unabated we might have been able to accept it, but we cannot accept the Prime Minister's statement that it is a diminishing threat unless he can give us some further details as the basis of his statement.

If the alternative means of meeting the threat to which the Prime Minister alluded is the Bomarc missile, some of us would have serious reservations about that, and we should like the Prime Minister to give us some more information about it. The Bomarc has not yet, to common knowledge, been proven, and early models have been less than satisfactory in performance. We assume that the model which the Canadian government intends to acquire is an improved version, but we should like to know what its capabilities are; we should like to know whether it is going to provide us with some semblance of security or if it is true, as some observers have suggested, that Russian bombers would be able to fly under these missiles, fly around them or perhaps, if they could jam the homing device which the missiles carry, fly safely through them. I am sure the Prime Minister has information on this subject, and we should like it to be made available to hon. members so that we would have a greater fund of knowledge on which to base our judgment.

The Prime Minister went on to say that in the middle sixties the missile would be the major threat and the long-range bomber would be relegated to a supplementary role. This is consistent with what most military observers have been telling us, but these observers have also stated that the Russians would still have an inventory of between 1,000 and 2,000 bombers capable of coming over the ice cap and presenting a threat to our national survival. We have been told repeatedly that there is a continuing requirement for manned interceptors. The Minister of National Defence himself said so on several

occasions; the supreme commander of NORAD and his deputy have also made statements to the effect that defence was needed against the manned bomber. They have gone even further and said the Arrow was required as part of the defence against the manned bomber.

Obviously, the government does not think so. In such circumstances the logical question is who is right, the experts or the government? The Prime Minister went on to say in his statement that the United States government, after full and sympathetic consideration, in consultation with the United States air force with regard to its possible use for the Arrow, had reached the conclusion that it was not economic for them to use the aircraft. Not economic, Mr. Speaker, or not politic? Perhaps our salesmen were not persuasive enough.

The statement went on to say that the CF-100 was still an effective weapon in the defence of North America against the bomber threat. The Prime Minister's statement should have been more precise. Is the CF-100 still effective against the total Russian capability as far as manned bombers are concerned? Surely the right hon. gentleman is not suggesting that? It is true it might be effective against part of the Russian inventory of bombers, but certainly it would not be effective against their recent jets. As a matter of fact the air force placed a requirement for a new version of the CF-100, to be known as the mark VI, which was to have an after-burner to increase its power and be equipped with an air to air guided missile. This was to be a stopgap between the present CF-100, now in squadron service, and the CF-105, but one of the first things the government did when it came to office one and a half years ago was to cancel this requirement.

The inconsistency of the Prime Minister's statement seemed to lie in the fact that he found it necessary to rationalize the government's decision by speaking of the very extensive cost of the Arrow. The figures he used were not figures which were common knowledge; they looked as if they had been picked from a hat. What we ask is that the Prime Minister should break down these figures in order that we may know how they have been put together and whether they do in fact represent the actual probable cost had the project been continued.

Later in his statement the Prime Minister said that defence requirements were the sole justification for defence procurement. No one, I am sure, quarrels with that thesis. Certainly in normal economic circumstances military necessity and military necessity alone should be considered. But one wonders,