

Supply—National Defence

Later he went on to say:

Even after missiles achieve the reliability and accuracy they now lack, Lemay said, there will always be a requirement for a mixture of manned and unmanned weapon systems.

Another witness we have is Mr. McElroy, the United States secretary of defence. Mr. McElroy told the defence appropriations committee of the United States congress that because the Russians are maintaining an inventory of manned bombers and because they are reported to be building a new supersonic manned bomber, manned interceptors will be required in North American defence for as many years as they can at present foresee, at least for the next five or ten years.

Then a witness from outside this continent, from the British ministry. This is a quotation from an article appearing in the *Ottawa Journal* of May 22, 1959:

Although missiles are gradually taking over as Britain's chief air weapon, the end of the manned fighter era is nowhere in sight. In fact, say defence ministry spokesmen in London—

The Deputy Chairman: Order. It being six o'clock I do now leave the chair.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The committee resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Chairman, at six o'clock I was discussing the Avro Arrow and the reasons why it had been cancelled. I had brought forward the evidence of a number of experts who all declared that manned interceptors would be required for a number of years to come. The evidence is overwhelming that manned interceptors are in fact a continuing requirement for the protection of the North American deterrent. If that is so, this question immediately arises: Why was the Avro Arrow cancelled?

In response to the question as to whether or not it was a good aircraft, let me again call Air Marshal Slemon as witness. I quote again from the same press conference at Colorado Springs to which I already made reference:

Choosing his words carefully, and with NORAD commander-in-chief General Earle T. Partridge standing at his side, Slemon said that if the CF-105 is put into operation it will be the best interceptor available for air defence of the continent until the U.S. F-108 is in operation five or six years hence.

We have been told a number of times that Canada cannot afford to do everything, yet here is a case where the one thing we were doing was the best in its field. No one has

ever told us that it was not the best manned interceptor available to the western world. And yet, when we were out front, when we were pre-eminent in a specific field, at a time when we had the best our government decided to cancel the thing which we had demonstrated we were able to do best.

No satisfactory explanation of the reason for the cancellation of the Arrow has ever been given. As I said, the statements made in the house by the Prime Minister and the Minister of National Defence were a mixture of military rationalization and a discussion of economic cost. The only conclusion to which we can come is that the Avro Arrow was scrapped because of the impossible financial position into which this government plunged the Canadian economy. The only other reason that has ever been adduced has been that there was some difference of opinion between members of the government or the Prime Minister and some members of the Avro company itself. We sincerely hope, now that heads have rolled, this reason will no longer be valid and that the Avro company will have an opportunity to produce an aircraft to re-equip the air division, and that the innocent victims who are at present not working in the Toronto area will have the opportunity to go back to work and to take their place as productive men and women in the Canadian economy.

What have been the Canadian losses as a result of this cancellation? They have been tremendous. We have seen the disintegration of a great industry which was built up over a decade. We have seen the disintegration of one of the best design teams in the western world. What has happened to it? Many of these scientists and engineers have gone back to the United Kingdom—

Mr. Speakman: Good.

Mr. Hellyer: One of the Conservative members says, "Good". Apparently he does not regret the loss to Canada of the training, experience, knowledge and skill of these people who have contributed so much to the industrial development of this country.

Mr. Speakman: They were interested only in the money they could make.

Mr. Hellyer: My Conservative friend states that they were interested only in the money they could earn.

Mr. Speakman: That is right.

Mr. Hellyer: They came to this country to establish themselves. They believed in this country and thought their talents could be utilized in the building up of this young, dynamic nation which they thought was going somewhere—