

*Supply—National Defence*

**Mr. Hellyer:** If I may resume where I left off—

Colonel Werner took the F-104 to 35,000, accelerated to 1,122 mph and nosed up to 50,000 feet. He completed his mission in 4 minutes, 57 seconds. No call from Major Krupinski. After 6 minutes, officials called him.

"Wo sind Sie, Krupinski?" he was asked.

"I am still at thirty five thousand, trying to accelerate past one point three," came the reply.

The next day, the late Jake Holliman provided the clincher. With a navy simulated mirror-type landing aid, he touched down in the first of hundreds of precision spot landing demonstration that he later did almost daily for observers.

The Germans came away convinced.

Later on the article says:

Out of talks grew a new idea. The Germans didn't want an off-the-shelf airplane. They wanted an improved model, with more all weather capabilities, more electronics.

And here we have just received confirmation from the minister that what the Germans want is a redesigned F-104. After all we have heard about this country not being in a position to develop a new weapon system we embark on another program of redesigning which will enable an aircraft not designed to do strike reconnaissance work to do the job which it was not designed to do.

The important thing about strike reconnaissance is not its ability to get to 50,000 feet fast. I should like to quote from *Aviation Week* of June 29 in further illustration of the German requirements in this matter:

General Brohon, who said it was impossible for France to expend the capital outlay needed to do the job, also called on the U.S. to provide his division in particular, and France in general, with an effective replacement aircraft to carry out the division's primary mission—reconnaissance. He would like most, he said, to see a reconnaissance version of the Lockheed F-104 developed by the U.S. and supplied to him under mutual security funds. Without such a replacement for the Republic RF-84F aircraft within the next two years, he added, his division would represent a "waste of human capital" rather than an effective combat force.

There are some other interesting observations in this magazine. For example:

Paris—Spectacular demonstration by the Swedish Saab Draken and some inspired flying by French and British acrobatic teams saved this 23rd international aeronautical salon from being just another air show.

Then it goes on:

Biggest disappointment was the Lockheed F-104B demonstration, flown by Lt. Col. James Jabara. The plane made only a takeoff, a single flyby and a landing.

The minister went on to talk about availability, and subsequently he told the committee in reply to a question by the Leader of the Opposition that other aircraft were equally available. And then he gave us the same kind of mixed assurance as we were

given earlier when the Avro Arrow decision was made. He said the decision was based on a combination of factors—on cost, on what work would be done in Canada, on the military value, on the degree to which Canadians could participate in production-sharing, and so on. We know these are important, Mr. Chairman, but surely if we can afford to do anything at all in defence matters we should do it well. As the minister said, other production-sharing arrangements were available to us. If I may, I should like to quote from the *Toronto Telegram* dated May 14, which reads as follows:

Ottawa (Special)—The federal government's choice of an aircraft to replace the F-86 Sabres for the Canadian air division abroad is between the Blackburn NA-39 and Republic's new strike attack interceptor, the 105-D Thunderchief . . . The choice has been narrowed to the Blackburn or Republic planes because the advantages of Canadian production of either of these are overwhelming as compared to others.

The article goes on to say:

Should the Blackburn aircraft be chosen Prime Minister John Diefenbaker could then implement in a dramatic way his "Commonwealth policy" expressed so forcibly last fall in his Albert Hall speech in London.

And the article ends as follows:

In meetings between the Prime Minister and Mundy Peel, president of the Republic Corporation, and John S. D. Tory, Q.C., vice-president of A. V. Roe Canada Limited, the Republic Corporation undertook that Canadian-made parts would be included in the American plane for the U.S. Air Force squadrons.

The planes for Canadian use would be the same as to air-frame but would be powered by the Canadian Iroquois engine.

The Prime Minister has repeatedly urged the necessity for Canadian participation in U.S. armament production and this latter proposal would allow him to implement this policy as well as reactivate the Orenda and Avro plants at Malton.

This decision, based on the grounds of military effectiveness, of production sharing and of cost, has, we feel, unfortunately placed military considerations in an inferior position. And then the minister in reply to my assertion last evening that a smaller number of other types of aircraft would do the job of the F-104, said: Emphatically no; we need more aircraft for the strike role. In reply to that, if engines need replacing every 100 hours, half the aircraft will be in the hangars and not available when required. Canadian airmen like to fly; they like to get in enough practice to become efficient in the handling of their aircraft, and they are bound to put in these hours of practice regularly if they are to be able to fly their aircraft confidently at low altitudes and concentrate on the fire power that these planes carry. Surely, when this state of efficiency has to be attained you