

Labour Crisis in Aircraft Industry

the Pinetree line I mentioned a while ago, and the other line—that in collaborating together in defence we should say to them, unless you buy everything we want you to take, you will not get any bases in Canada, well, what would that mean? It would mean withdrawal from NORAD. What would our relationship be within NATO? I believe that we must strongly advocate and press upon the United States, as we have the necessity, as the Leader of the Opposition said, of the fullest co-operation in connection with production. We must do that forcibly, strongly and continually, to the end that we receive in Canada, being joined in defence, a fair and just distribution of the expenses being made jointly.

I believe that to say to the United States, on whose shoulders rests in large measure the maintenance of the freedom not only of our country but generally throughout the free world today, either you do this or you get out, is not in keeping with the responsibilities of that hon. gentleman. Indeed it could not be countenanced for a moment on the part of any nation to a friendly nation joined together in North America by the bonds of geography, common tradition and common dedication. This may sound all right in certain quarters, but it is that kind of irresponsibility that has brought about the transition from former greatness to the present numerical content of those who support that type of statement.

We need to press constantly upon the United States the necessity for giving to us, as I said a moment ago, a fair and just distribution. The Minister of National Defence (Mr. Pearkes), the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Smith) and the Minister of Defence Production (Mr. O'Hurley), have been in constant communication with their counterparts in the United States. We have not achieved everything that we want. We are not satisfied. We shall continue to press, and forcibly press.

One of the things of which I was convinced more than anything else in my tour around the world was this: Those who are joined in freedom must maintain unity with the fullest respect for the rights of each other. Economic strength must be maintained if we are to meet that challenge which in the last several months has become even more direct, particularly since Mr. Khrushchev's speech to the council during the latter days of January.

What have we done in connection with our sovereignty? As far as the DEW line is concerned, we have taken over, as was said the other day, its operational control. We are taking over the airfields in the north, and in the course of the next two or three years,

these airfields will be operated by us. We are ensuring that our sovereignty over the northern area shall be maintained.

They used to speak of the vision I had of northern Canada. I spoke of the tremendous possibilities of the north, not only for defence but for economic strength and stability, and there were those who said we build from igloo to igloo. In the last few weeks we find that some 70 million acres of potential oil lands and mineral lands in the north have been taken over, thereby indicating that a major source of Canada's wealth is in that area. We must continue to assert there our sovereignty and this we are now doing, particularly, first, by occupying these radar stations in the north and, secondly, through the instrumentation of resource development in those areas.

May I say in addition that when they speak of this expenditure of some \$7 million or \$8 million for the CF-105 we should provide our own defence unless the United States provides it on the basis we want. Is it possible for 17 million souls to be able to make a contribution in respect of these costly weapons, these tools of defence, and endeavour at the same time to maintain a similar expenditure to that of a nation of ten times our population?

Having dealt with that, let me speak for a moment of the CF-105. The Leader of the Opposition was quite fair this afternoon when he said there were certain facts which we did not have before us. One of those facts I think will, when known by the Canadian people, begin to give them an appreciation of the areas which would have been defended by the CF-105. Most people that I have talked to have been under the impression that the CF-105 would constitute an instrument capable of protecting our northern areas. The vast unpopulated north would have available to it an air force which would be able to defend Canada against any potential aggressor. I am now reading from an article which appears in the current issue of the *Atlantic Advocate*. It is entitled "Aviation's Year of Decision". It deals with the CF-105, and it says this:

National pride is considerably involved and is, perhaps the greatest single force behind the Arrow program, as at present outlined . . . Avro is not by any means the whole Canadian aircraft industry. Its employment figures are about one-fourth the industry's total.

Then it goes on to deal with the various types of aircraft manufactured by de Havilland and Canadair.

The supersonic speeds of today's bombers, and the interceptors to meet them, make this vision of air "patrol" a thing of the past. The Arrow probably has a flight time of an hour, including climb to required altitude and a few minutes of