

*Committee on Defence Expenditure*

CF-100 affected R.C.A.F. training, and have our NATO squadrons been equipped with them? Much has been said about our NATO squadrons. The CF-100 is a particularly useful aircraft for that sort of service. Another question is this: Why have so many Canadian engineers and technicians left Avro, men such as Edward Aitkin, who was the designer of the CF-100 and the jet liner; Paul Dilworth and Winnett Boyd, designers of the Orenda engine; Richard Fairthorne, who was the industrial relations manager; John Berry, who was the director of manufacturing, and Elwood Butler, who was the treasurer. These men have all left this company which, if not our major producer, is at least our second largest aircraft producer in Canada.

Why has that happened? Why have these head men left, these technical men who helped to design and bring into early production one excellent engine, an extremely useful medium range commercial jet aircraft, and a very good long distance interceptor? Nearly all the original staff have left. My friends and those with whom I talk question me as to what is wrong with this concern. I have heard—and this is general talk—that there is considerable resentment, that the Canadian personnel are being supplanted by United States and United Kingdom personnel when the Canadian personnel did the pioneering and brought the three types of aircraft into production the whole way from the drawing board. I think the defence committee is entitled to an answer to the problem of Avro Canada. I am a booster of Avro Canada. We have produced three first-class pieces of equipment, the jet liner, the CF-100 and the Orenda engine. Yet what is the production? Why was the jet liner production stopped? There must be an answer. It is not a matter of wrongdoing; it is a matter of national interest. Probably hundreds of millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money have been put into this concern. What are we going to do about it? If we are to have a committee to look into defence expenditures, then surely this would be one of the first things we should inquire into.

This becomes especially true when right next door is de Havilland, where three types of aircraft have been designed. These are all Canadian types, and are known as the Chipmunk, the Beaver and the Otter. When I visited that plant the 421st Beaver was on the production line, being prepared for the United States air force. It is the only Canadian firm producing a Canadian-built aircraft for the United States air force. It is a firm that has sent aircraft to forty different countries; bear in mind that I am referring to de Havilland of Canada, not the parent company.

[Mr. Adamson.]

It has sent its product to forty different countries and eleven different air forces. Yet not one of those aircraft has been ordered by the Royal Canadian Air Force. What is the reason for this? The United States air force has paid the de Havilland company the compliment of stating that it is the only aircraft producer in North America that is up to date and on schedule in its deliveries.

Here is a Canadian company with Canadian personnel, using Canadian designs, Canadian engines, Canadian materials and Canadian workmen, and situated right next door to Avro, or at least comparatively near. Why on one side of the town line do we have this very successful aircraft company and, on the other side, an aircraft company which is constantly running into difficulty? Is it because of government interference?

These are matters which the defence committee should discuss. Let us consider Canadair, which is a subsidiary of the Electric Boat Company, now known as General Dynamics Corporation. Canadair is a very successful aircraft producer. Admittedly the company is producing aircraft of United States design with United States engines, and has open to it the advantage of a pipe line of United States machinery and instruments. For this reason it does not run into many of the difficulties confronting Avro. Nevertheless it is producing as was announced in the press at a rate of approximately 40 per month. Under the circumstances that is an excellent record.

It is also producing the T-33 trainer, which is a jet aircraft. Canadair is a private company. As a matter of fact when it became a private Canadian company I availed myself of the privilege of buying a few shares of its stock. Let me say that, even as a small shareholder in the company, I get infinitely more information about it than I do as a member of parliament or of the defence committee. I pay taxes and my constituents pay taxes to support this great company and pay for the production from it. Yet I, as a member of the defence committee, do not get as much information about details of production and the problems connected therewith as I do in the role of shareholder in the company.

Surely that is wrong, Mr. Speaker. This is one of the things the defence committee should consider, and one of the blind spots in our whole defence mechanism. There is no wrongdoing here, nothing like that. It is simply a matter of giving proper information, and having proper discussion of the problems with the people's representatives. We are supposed to answer to our constituents. We are not supposed to return to our homes and say that we are satisfied with what we