

Labour Crisis in Aircraft Industry

be ridiculous. But I do suggest to the government that they let the United States authorities know in no uncertain terms that rather than continue the process of tying our defence resources to the United States in such a way that we get only tag ends of orders and nothing else, instead of allowing Canadian squadrons to be armed with missiles made in the United States and paid for by the United States taxpayer, we might have to see whether we can work out a new system of defence planning and development, or at least explore the possibility of co-operation in this field with Great Britain and the European members of the North Atlantic alliance.

We cannot possibly divorce ourselves from United States contact. The hon. gentlemen opposite are always the first to state that we should be moving our lines of contact across the Atlantic. I wonder whether the Minister of National Defence has considered the possibility of replacement of the CF-105 with British production and some kind of agreement in regard to continental defence? If we cannot be successful with the United States, surely that would be the second best alternative.

The normal, natural and sensible thing to do is to work out the kind of continental arrangements which we had with the United States during the war, which worked very successfully. For some years after the war that arrangement was not necessary in the way it was during the war, because we were building up NATO and building up the kind of armament development under NATO which emphasized the importance of the western European front. Then a few years ago it became quite clear—and the Canadian delegates of the NATO council were among those who did their best to make it clear—that perhaps the most important NATO front was North America. I think that became clear once the Russians were able to develop jet bombers followed by intercontinental ballistic missiles. Once it became clear that the Russians had the capacity to attack the industrial production of the United States, the Canadian arctic became the NATO major front, and from that day on the United States should have been aware of that fact, not only in planning and operation but in industry and production, and I hope it is not too late to make them aware of it yet.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, when we rose at six o'clock I was discussing one very important aspect of this question, namely, the

relation between the defence industries of the two countries and the necessity of making collective defence mean more than the placing of Canadian air squadrons under NORAD.

In his statement last Friday the Prime Minister said that the government intends that Canadian forces shall be well trained and well equipped for the Canadian share of these tasks in a balanced collective defence. It does not seem to me possible that we should be able to achieve this ideal of an appropriate Canadian share in a balanced collective defence if we do not have a Canadian defence industry including an aircraft production industry, and it does not seem to me we shall be able to have such an industry if our scientists, our engineers and our technicians leave this country to take up employment in the United States. When the Prime Minister makes a statement such as I have mentioned, we ask ourselves: what is to be the Canadian share in this balanced collective defence? Is what we are now proposing to do by the cancellation of this contract and in the working out of alternative methods of defence, the course for which we are particularly qualified, or are we from now on merely adding our bit to what is predominantly a United States effort? Does the United States government accept, as it used to accept at the NATO council meetings in Paris in earlier years when we were talking about NATO forces with regard to continental defence, this concept of balance, this concept of togetherness in the development of defence resources and in the manufacture and development of defence equipment, or does it merely accept this concept in terms of operation and planning? The worries we have had on this score—worries which have been increasing over the years—must, I think, be much greater now in the light of the decision which the government has found it necessary to make and in the light of the statement made by the Minister of National Defence which gives us so little hope of sharing in any real way in continental defence resources and defence projects.

The Prime Minister's statement attempted to apply this principle of balanced collective defence to the co-operation between the two countries in the use of nuclear warheads for defence, tactical weapons. I do not think that attempt was a success. The statement had a good deal to say about this subject, and no subject could be much more important. The Prime Minister said in his statement that we did not intend in this country to produce or manufacture nuclear weapons. We on this side certainly have no quarrel with that. As I said the other day in the short statement I made following the Prime Minister, it is