

*Labour Crisis in Aircraft Industry*

That is the end of the telegram. I think the very strong wording of these telegrams, signed by responsible officials of the unions involved, shows the feeling of the Canadian people and the workers affected to the announcement that was made and the action that was taken, and particularly to the way the action was taken by this government. It is a question entirely separate and apart from whether or not Canada, in an economic sense, was able to or should have continued with the production of the CF-105. However, there is certainly condemnation of the government for making this announcement in such a manner, and putting people on the street without any consideration at all.

A statement by Crawford Gordon appeared in this morning's *Globe and Mail*, the first paragraph of which reads as follows:

As I indicated in my brief statement on Friday, the Prime Minister's announcement cancelling forthwith the Arrow and Iroquois programs came as a complete surprise to the company. We received no advance notice whatever of the Friday announcement itself nor did any government department seek prior consultation with the company to arrange for an orderly and gradual cease-work procedure.

It would seem to me that if the government decided to make this decision it should have been made in an orderly manner in order that the people involved in the industry may have had a better opportunity to obtain alternate employment.

What was the attitude of the government toward the development of alternate defence arrangements with the United States? It would seem to me that the government has no concrete plans, that they have not in any of their representations to the United States obtained adequate assurance that this would be a true partnership and that Canada would get its share of defence orders. The Prime Minister, in speaking in the house on Friday, had this to say, as recorded at the bottom of page 1222 of *Hansard*:

As for the technical equipment which is to be financed by the United States, both governments recognize the need for Canada to share in the production of this equipment. Within the principles of production sharing the United States government and the Canadian government expect that a reasonable and fair share of this work will in fact be carried out by Canadian industry. To that end a number of groups of officials representing both countries have been established to initiate the production sharing activities and to deal with the problems involved. I might add that early next week the Minister of Defence Production will make full information available to the house in this connection.

There is the statement of the Prime Minister, that within the principles of production sharing the United States government and the Canadian government expect that

a reasonable and fair share of this work will in fact be carried out by Canadian industry. I say that is a statement of satisfaction by the Prime Minister; that is a statement by the Prime Minister that the partnership is working and that the United States government recognizes the principle of production sharing. This is a far cry from the attitude of the members of this government when they were on this side of the house, when they were stating in no uncertain terms that Canada's share of this production should be increased; that the government of the day should obtain greater concessions from the government of the United States.

Now we have the statement of the Prime Minister that the principles of production sharing are recognized by the United States government. This is in advance of the statement by the Minister of Defence Production (Mr. O'Hurley) which I suggest was hollow, inadequate and a great disappointment in the light of the statement that had been made by the Prime Minister last Friday. This government is satisfied, according to the record, with what I consider to be shabby treatment by the United States. The Minister of Defence Production said today that at the last meeting held in December production sharing was one of the important subjects discussed. He also said that the Hyde Park declaration of April, 1941 and the statement of principles for economic co-operation of October, 1950, recognized that the production and resources of Canada and the United States should be used co-operatively for defence in order to achieve the best combined results.

Then, he goes on in the next part of his statement to say that there has always been co-operation between the two countries in utilizing each other's defence production resources. Apparently this general satisfaction is not just general satisfaction with today's position but it is a satisfaction that goes back for a great many years, according to statements that are being made at this time.

With what does the government take such great satisfaction? Has Canada now reached a position where she obtains a large quantity of defence orders from the United States? The government is no longer in a position to point an accusing finger at the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Pearson) and say, "Why did you not do something about it?" because the government has now been in office for 18 months. For a year and a half they have been in a position to do something about it. What have they done about it? I submit, very little.

The Minister of Defence Production in his statement this afternoon went on to say that