

*Labour Crisis in Aircraft Industry*

made of the government this afternoon. We are asked to hold on to the technical people of this country in face of the government's policy to put them on the street and force them, in many instances, to seek work in other countries.

Then what is to happen to our national sovereignty? How are we going to maintain our independence if we are to surrender the defence of this continent to the United States without insisting, as a nation, on our fair share of industrial production and our taking a full partnership in this whole matter? We in the C.C.F. party do not have the same kind of faith in the present NORAD arrangements that is held by members of other parties. When this question was being discussed in the house last year we said that in our opinion the first place to make our defence effort was through the United Nations. If it was impossible to have the kind of collective security through the United Nations that would seem to guarantee our nation the maximum amount of defence, then as a second choice we should place our partnership on a NATO basis. It should be placed on a multi-nation basis such as the North Atlantic partnership, with which Canada has co-operated for so many years. But this government said: No, although North American defence may be said to be a part of NATO, it is basically a North American show, a partnership between Canada and the United States. And so, without our European allies, we have undertaken the defence of Canada in partnership with the United States. I say that the success being made of this partnership today shows that also for North American defence we should have stayed within the general framework of NATO and not have taken on ourselves the responsibility for North Atlantic defence on the basis which has now been adopted.

This government is not standing up to the United States. This government has said it is satisfied with the principles of co-operation that have been formulated today. Yet on the basis of what has been achieved to date we receive only an insignificant part of United States defence orders. This government, which has in the past defended the cause of national sovereignty, and claimed it would maintain full employment in our country, has made an announcement which will have the effect of increasing unemployment; an announcement which shows, also, that we are not maintaining our sovereignty in this partnership; an announcement which has led to a front page editorial in the *Globe and Mail* declaring that the government and the cabinet is fraught with internal weaknesses. The *Globe and Mail*, a great supporter of this government, has said that not only

has the action taken so far been evidence of incompetence as far as defence is concerned but—going even further—that it reveals a major and widely spread internal weakness of the government; a failure not just in one but in several of its departments to look and plan ahead. The newspaper says, further:

This weakness has been apparent since the government assumed office 20 months ago, but never, in that time, has it been so dramatically disclosed.

What is the main headline in the *Globe and Mail*? The headline reads: "Frost to Call 'Best Brains' to Save Avro Plant, Jobs." The premier of the province of Ontario is endeavouring to step into the situation to rescue the Canadian economy from the effects of the tragic mistakes and blunders made by the federal Conservative cabinet. This is an indication of how high in the esteem of Premier Frost is held the defence policy of this government.

I make a plea to the government, in spite of the evidence of its weakness and indecision, in spite of the great and mounting evidence that in the United States Canada is being given the brush-off, that it should say to the United States in very definite terms: either Canada is given a fair share of defence orders; either we are taken in as a full partner in this defence arrangement or the partnership is off, if this kind of shabby treatment is given to our country.

**Mr. Churchill:** Then what do we do?

**Mr. Argue:** You did not have to infer from that question that you are getting this kind of shabby treatment. Apparently that is just the inference in that statement. I say it is shabby treatment, and if the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Churchill) wants to admit that Canada is being kicked around, let him stand up and admit it. I am saying that from the standpoint of the interest of Canada and from the interest of most Canadians our nation is not a full partner in this arrangement, as has been stated by the Minister of National Defence today, and that along the lines of the statements made by the Prime Minister so often in the past. We say that Canada should speak up to Washington and be firm in making her legitimate requests instead of making to the Canadian people these statements which add up to an abject surrender to the United States. The evidence is contained in the figures given us by the Minister of Defence Production today.

**Mr. Pearkes:** Nonsense.

**Mr. Green:** May I ask a question? Does the hon. member think the contract should have been continued?