

*Labour Crisis in Aircraft Industry*

from other sources of information. His are official, of course, and we must accept them. He did not give us the range because he said it was a matter of security. The range of the Bomarc has been given in congressional hearings in very considerable detail as being between 250 and 300 miles at the present time, to go up to 400 miles with the addition of new equipment. The ceiling the minister said this afternoon, and I got this figure also from United States official sources, is about 75,000 feet. We are not informed that there is a 50 per cent chance of this missile not functioning.

If the cost is \$500,000 per missile, which is the figure I was able to secure but which apparently is not correct, and there are 120 to a squadron you have a cost of \$60 million for missiles for R.C.A.F. squadrons. These are one-shot missiles. This afternoon the minister said that two squadrons would cost \$110 million, and this is for a new weapon which may or may not be effective but which is certainly going to be expensive. Those of us who are worried about the possibility of this United States weapon not doing the job it is supposed to do, if not replacing, supplementing the CF-100 or as some had hoped the CF-105, have certainly had our worry on that score increased if we can put any credence in a statement in an article in the *Globe and Mail* this morning from its Washington correspondent, Philip Deane, who said that a growing anxiety has been created in the United States as to the effectiveness of this weapon.

This supplementary weapon, these Bomarcs are not to be made in this country. We had some hope last autumn that they would be produced in Canada. When the Prime Minister was asked on September 24 at a press conference, after discussion of his statement at that time about this matter, whether Canada would produce Bomarcs for United States as well as Canadian use, the Prime Minister is reported to have replied that we would start with Canadian production only. This certainly indicated that these new weapons would be manufactured in Canada under licence. The September announcement gave us that impression because one paragraph of that announcement reads:

It is hoped that our defence industry will be able to share with United States industry in one part or another of the major programs for air defence of the North American continent, thereby providing alternative employment in the field of missiles or electronics.

Apparently nothing was done or nothing was successfully achieved in bringing about this effective sharing between Canadian and United States industries in the provision of these supplementary weapons. We have,

therefore, the right to ask the government, as has already been asked this afternoon, what part is Canada to play in the industrial and employment side of the Sage program, the ballistic missile early warning system program and the Bomarc program? No light is thrown on this subject by the statement of the Minister of Defence Production this afternoon nor, except in a very minor way, by the statement of the Prime Minister last Friday.

We did learn from the Prime Minister's statement last Friday that the Bomarc would be manufactured in the United States for Canadian use and as such of course it has to fit into the United States continental defence system, with SAGE, otherwise it would not be of much use to us in Canada. In that sense, this arrangement is bound to tie us more closely to strictly United States production, United States industrial requirements. I wonder if that is why the United States is paying the cost of these Bomarc missiles for use in Canada? I understood the Prime Minister's statement to mean just that, and he will correct me if I am wrong. He said that the United States, as part of its two-thirds share of the cost of this Bomarc program will pay for, and I quote his words, "the acquisition of technical equipment". Presumably that is a reference to the Bomarc missile itself.

If that is true, is the United States likely to ever agree that missiles, paid for by the United States, will be made in Canada at any time in the future? Indeed, if they are to be weapons made in Canada for R.C.A.F. squadrons, why should the United States be asked to pay for them? Are we now, under this Bomarc arrangement, accepting for the first time mutual aid from the United States, something which we did not do during the whole course of the war? Is that the new Hyde Park agreement? If that is the case, Mr. Speaker, if the United States is going to pay for weapons used in Canada by the R.C.A.F., then one cannot help but wonder whether it would not be more consistent with our national position or national pride to turn the whole Bomarc and SAGE operation over to the United States, and do something else by way of defence which would have a Canadian character and be paid for by Canada.

If, however, I am wrong in my understanding that the technical equipment referred to in the statement of the Prime Minister is not the missile, what is it? And whatever it is, why should the United States ever be asked to transfer its production to Canada in regard to technical equipment to be paid for by the United States, and some of it at least under its control? What we want is not this kind