

Labour Crisis in Aircraft Industry

of arrangement. What we want is not financial help from the United States for equipment produced in Canada for Canadian forces. Surely we can take care of ourselves in that regard. What we want, and have wanted for a long time, is access to the United States market for defence equipment which can be made in Canada for United States forces; at least, give us a chance to bid on such equipment for American forces. Collective defence must mean collective production. It must mean, as the Prime Minister said in his statement, pooling of resources. If it does not mean that, and if continental defence means collective planning and operation only and not collective development of defence resources or production on a continental basis, if Canadian resources and production can be considered by the United States as insecure, then we should have a hard look at the situation and talk very frankly to Washington.

In public statements which I made in the United States—and I have been criticized in this house by the Prime Minister for making those statements—I have said that it will be quite impossible to have that kind of defence co-operation which is desirable between the two countries if we have economic and industrial conflict at the same time; and it will be quite impossible to have collective defence for one aspect of defence, and separate defence for the industrial and economic aspect of defence.

One might say that if we criticize the government for not having driven this home to the United States in connection with the CF-105 program in a way which would have secured some orders from the United States which might have made this program more economic than it otherwise would be, why did we not do this while we were in office during the earlier days of the program? The answer to that is quite a simple one. The minister of defence of that day took the question up with the defence authorities in Washington when we were beginning a prototype in the very early days of development, and he got an encouraging reaction at that time it is true. Later the reaction was not so encouraging. However, it must be clear to every hon. member of the house that the United States was not going to commit itself to a contract to purchase a weapon which had not been tested and had not been flown. Once the CF-105 showed itself to be the effective weapon which the Prime Minister's statement said it was, that was the time to take the matter up in a very vigorous way on the highest governmental level with the authorities in Washington.

The minister said he discussed this matter in Washington. He said he discussed it in

[Mr. Pearson.]

Paris at the NATO meeting, at which I believe he and his colleague from Washington took advantage to have a meeting of the joint committee of defence ministers. But if the minister on that occasion was not successful, and if it was decided by the government that it would be impossible to go ahead with the CF-105 program without some kind of order which would cushion expenditure for Canada, then I hope it was made perfectly clear to the authorities in Washington that if that was their final and irrevocable decision in respect of a weapon which was now admitted to be a going concern we would have to review very seriously the whole question of continental economic and industrial collective defence.

Mr. Churchill: May I ask the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Pearson) a question?

Mr. Pearson: Yes, certainly.

Mr. Churchill: After that review, would the hon. member advocate going as far as is proposed by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Argue)?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, there is no way by which we in Canada can dissociate, or should try to dissociate, ourselves from the United States in the defence of our country, of our continent, and of the free world. It is obviously impossible, even if it were desirable, which it is not. The Minister of National Defence said today, and I was amazed to hear him say it, that some years ago we stood alone in the defence of this program. They were the words he used, "We stand alone". He also said there was no planning for continental defence in those years—

Mr. Pearkes: No agreement.

Mr. Pearson: No formal treaty or agreement. Perhaps I might remind the hon. minister in regard to that rather shattering statement that we have never stood alone in regard to collective defence at any time since world war II. We were among the leaders in building up an Atlantic system of collective defence, which included the United States. As the hon. minister and other hon. members of the government have more than once told us, there was a North American region of NATO. And NATO was founded in 1950. If there was a North American region of NATO in 1950, how can he say that we stood alone in regard to continental defence? Of course, we do not stand alone, and we cannot stand alone.

I am not suggesting that we should go to the United States and say that if they do not do a certain thing we will withdraw from the NATO alliance or the western association, or anything like that. Of course that would