

to protect the interests of Canadian productive capacity through sharing in the vast contracts required for the defence of this continent.

Reference was also made, and very properly so, to the fact that the ability to obtain production contracts would depend on the extent to which Canadian scientific, engineering and technical personnel had an opportunity to participate in the development programs leading up to the production stage. I can only comment with some feeling that such a statement unfortunately comes at a time when the government itself has been taking steps that cannot help but disperse Canadian scientific and technical personnel, and that there is very little hope of such personnel participating in joint development projects if scientific and technical personnel teams in this country have already been dispersed by government action.

The figures given of the comparative expenditures in the two countries for the last few years only tend to emphasize the extent to which production activity in this field has tended to run down. Perhaps I should say no more at this point, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Hazen Argue (Assiniboia):** Mr. Speaker, in the context of the sweeping announcement made last Friday the statement that has now been made to the house by the Minister of Defence Production is exceedingly disappointing, and I am sure will constitute little comfort for the 14,000 people who were thrown out on the streets last Friday almost as unceremoniously as garbage is placed on the streets for collection.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Argue:** We have listened to the statement of the Minister of Defence Production. There is little or nothing in it of a concrete nature. He has talked about joint committees, about working groups, about discussions that are going on. But where is the action? Where are the concrete results? They are not to be found in his statement.

The Minister of Defence Production does not talk about contracts of a sizeable nature in relation to the defence program of this continent. He talks about potential contracts. He talks about making the necessary arrangements. Then, as if to throw ice water on the possibility of Canada sharing in defence contracts with the United States in a real sense, he says that after all Canadian industry will have to compete with the Americans on a competitive basis. I think in the light of the experience we have had in the past, in the light of our knowledge of the pressure that is placed on the United

States administration by congress, this statement is an empty one. In view of the loss to the Canadian economy occasioned by such steps as were taken last Friday, it is hollow and meaningless.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, this is a clear demonstration of the fact that the government has no policy, and that we are not sharing with the United States in an effective way in defence production orders. In order to illustrate how relatively insignificant the sharing to date has been, one needs only reiterate the figures given by the minister, namely that in 1958 Canada shared in prime contracts to the extent of just \$40 million. This represents a very tiny proportion of the defence cost to our nation, not much more than 2 per cent of the defence cost to Canada.

The minister went on to say that we have a prime contract for the production of certain parts of the Bomarc missile, totalling \$1.7 million. This, in my opinion, demonstrates to the country that the government has no policy; that this government is incapable of planning in the defence field, and that by this statement today, coupled with the statement of the Prime Minister on Friday and the lack of a firm agreement with the United States, the very sovereignty of the Canadian nation is today threatened. Our sovereignty is threatened because our government has not worked out an arrangement with the United States under which we could share in defence production in a realistic manner. I see smiles on the faces of members of the government, but I can tell them this is no smiling matter.

## EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

### MOTION TO REFER ESTIMATES TO STANDING COMMITTEE

On the order: Government notices of motion:

February 20—The Secretary of State for External Affairs—The following proposed motion:—That items numbered 76 to 105, inclusive, as listed in the main estimates 1959-60, relating to the Department of External Affairs, be withdrawn from the committee of supply and referred to the standing committee on external affairs, saving always the power of the committee of supply in relation to the voting of public moneys.

**Mr. Speaker:** Pursuant to section 2 of standing order 21 this government notice of motion stands transferred to and ordered for consideration under government orders at the next sitting of the house.

## LABOUR CONDITIONS

### CRISIS IN AIRCRAFT INDUSTRY—MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT UNDER STANDING ORDER 26

**Hon. Paul Hellyer (Trinity):** I ask leave to move the adjournment of the house, Mr.