

Labour Crisis in Aircraft Industry

to happen? They are going to seek other work of a comparable nature, and the place they are likely to get it under the circumstances in which we are, is the United States of America. When they procure work in the United States of America how are you going to carry on your share of production in anything but the simpler articles?

The whole tenor of the Prime Minister's remarks ignored that facet of the problem. He did not deal with it at all. He tried to show that the termination was known to the company, and quoted union leaders who came here seeking the assurance of work for their men, and he indicated from that that the union leaders knew it was being terminated. Does it not merely prove the union leaders were doing what it was their duty to do, namely to seek work for their personnel, and what other more proper humanitarian interests could they have than that? Surely, that is what it proves; it is not what the Prime Minister sought to indicate it proves.

To indicate the seriousness of this matter, I take it that there was no controverting of the statements this afternoon that the government had not been meeting with A. V. Roe with a view to trying to find a method of using at least part of this scientific and highly trained engineering and technical personnel in other productive capacities which would meet up to date requirements of defence, the latest strategic type of weapons, and so on. They did not deign to meet with them. In the statement of the president of A. V. Roe this point was made:

Since the Prime Minister's original announcement September 23, which cast doubt on the future of the program, the company has repeatedly proposed to various government departments and even to Mr. Diefenbaker himself alternate programs for the useful employment of the technical resources that have been assembled at Malton and which are second to none in the western world.

However, the government has not seen fit to discuss these matters or consult with us in any way.

The Prime Minister did not address himself to that statement of the president of the company.

Mr. Churchill: He said it was incorrect.

Mr. McIlraith: He did not tell us which ministers discussed the programs or when the discussions took place.

Mr. Pickersgill: Or what suggestions the government made.

Mr. McIlraith: He did not deal with that at all, and it is apparent from the whole handling of the subject and the debate we have had today that the government have addressed themselves to the question of whether or not they should terminate the

contract, and not to the larger question of what they should or should not do to preserve and make use of this section of great skill and ability to its best advantage for defence purposes.

The lead editorial in the *Toronto Globe and Mail* this morning is rather interesting. It is right on the front page in the left-hand column, and I am sure hon. members have read it. It begins:

The Diefenbaker government's decision to end the Arrow aircraft and Iroquois engine development program—without having anything to put in its place—reveals a major, and widely spread, internal weakness of that government; a failure, not just in one but in several of its departments, to look and to plan ahead. This weakness has been apparent since the government assumed office 20 months ago; but never, in that time, has it been so dramatically disclosed.

I want not only to quote those words but to assume responsibility for quoting them and so make them my own. I hear the ministry laughing at this matter. Does the ministry realize that what they have done is to dissolve this whole segment of the productive capacity of Canada? I know that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Harkness) does not understand that, but I do wish he would possess himself of patience and let some of the hon. members who are concerned with some of these matters deal with them.

Mr. Harkness: If I did not understand it better than you, I would not speak on it.

Mr. McIlraith: The minister thinks that is a smart remark, but I will not engage in personalities with him. That is the whole attitude of the present government, to seek to engage in personalities and go on with their election campaigning, instead of dealing with the question before the house. The editorial I quoted goes on to say something else which I think the Minister of Agriculture should listen to:

True enough, Prime Minister Diefenbaker assures us that there will be "greater opportunities" than in the past for Canadian industry to participate in the production of military equipment for North American defence. But we have been getting such promises for many years—without anything acceptable in the way of fulfilment. Now, it would seem, the situation is going to become even worse; not merely will our defence plants fail to get U.S. orders, but they will shut down completely, with U.S. plants taking over their job of supplying Canadian requirements.

No part of that was dealt with in the statement of the Minister of Defence Production (Mr. O'Hurley) today.

This (as his political opponents are already noting) is the exact opposite of what Mr. Diefenbaker pledged in his 1958 election campaign—a greater development of a more independent Canada by, and for, Canadians. How has the Prime Minister