

*Supply—National Defence*

have children. I am wondering whether the minister might give some indication as to whether this particular general policy—and I assume it is a general policy—might be the subject of some review and reconsideration.

**Mr. Regnier:** Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the plea made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre with regard to the education of the children of the personnel located at the R.C.A.F. station at St. James. In 1957 the Canadian government was providing for the education of the Roman Catholic children using the English or the French language. But in 1958 an agreement was made with the city of St. James providing for the education of the personnel at the station. However, the children desiring to attend separate schools were overlooked. Since this is a right of all Canadians to be educated at schools to which they want to go, in the province of Manitoba separate schools are legal. As a matter of fact, the constitution of the province of Manitoba is the same as the constitution of the province of Quebec. In 1870 when the constitution was drafted the Roman Catholics of Manitoba were in the majority, and this constitution was made in order to protect the minority of the future. Now it is the Roman Catholics who are in the minority. I believe that the federal government should see that the children of the personnel at the R.C.A.F. station have the same rights as those in the army. Right across the river from there the children of the personnel stationed at Fort Osborne, for example, are provided for at the expense of the government. Our troops in West Germany are provided for at considerable expense. Teachers are sent from Canada to Germany to teach both in the separate schools and in the public schools. I think this is an irritating matter that is not conducive to Canadian national unity. It is not a serious matter. It is not a matter of much expense. I should like the minister really to look into this matter.

**Mr. Hellyer:** Mr. Chairman, the minister yesterday announced that eight squadrons of the air division in Europe were to be re-equipped with the F-104. Those of us on this side of the house indicated our satisfaction that a decision had finally been made even though we were advised last night that the commitment had been made in December, 1957 and the government had had all of these intervening months in which to consider the matter. We were glad the decision had been made because if the air division is to be retained in Europe, it must be well equipped. Our satisfaction at the fact that a decision had been made is lessened by

[Mr. McGee.]

the nature of that decision because of what we have learned of the characteristics of the F-104.

The minister told us last night that it was primarily a strike fighter and that it had no other role. Yet upon examination we find that the F-104 was designed to be an air superiority fighter, the last of the air superiority day fighters. It holds the world speed and altitude records. To be able to do this, in order to provide this capability, air frame stability was sacrificed in the design.

We are advised that there are certain manoeuvres that the plane cannot do, that it is subject to stick "judders" when approaching manoeuvre limits, thereby warning the pilot that the plane is nearing the point where there will be loss of control. We further understand that the F-104 was grounded two years ago by the United States air force because of trouble with afterburner controls and power trim settings, although these difficulties have presumably been overcome. We further understand that the fatality rate of F-104 planes and pilots in the U.S.A.F. is unusually high. The accident rate is about double that of other U.S.A.F. fighters.

It is true that the F-104 used by the U.S.A.F. is not the Mark G contemplated for our air division but the G differs from the others mainly in electronic equipment, there being no change in the air frame or engine.

Why did the government not choose either the Grumman F-11-F Super Tiger or the Republic F-105 Thunderchief? Both of these aircraft were designed specifically for the strike role and both are very stable weapon platforms. The characteristics of the Thunderchief as outlined to the U.S. house appropriations committee are as follows:

The F-105 is manufactured by Republic Aviation at Farmingdale, N.Y. It is powered by one J-75 turbojet engine, manufactured by Pratt & Whitney, United Aircraft Corp, Hartford, Conn.

It is an all-weather tactical fighter. It is being procured to modernize our tactical fighter force. It will provide partial modernization of forces equipped with F-100's which do not have the performance needed in the 1960 time period to enable it to compete favourably with first-line aircraft of other nations.

The principal characteristics of the F-105 are:

1. It can fly at supersonic speeds.
2. It has an accurate, self-contained navigation system that is independent of vulnerable, ground-based aids to navigation.
3. It is equipped with a radar system which makes it possible to attack ground targets under all weather conditions.
4. The F-105 can deliver a wide variety of conventional munitions should the situation demand.

The F-105 is a jack-of-all-trades, capable of gaining air superiority or attacking ground targets with nuclear or conventional weapons. It will also be equipped with one M-61 20 mm. cannon.