

Labour Crisis in Aircraft Industry

waiting; we have been hoping; we have been dreaming. We are Canadian through to the core; we are so proud of this achievement of ours that we could stand on the rooftops and shout, and now the whole thing is disappearing in front of our very eyes and we do not know where we go from here."

The whole electronics industry has been put in jeopardy, and just at a time when its products were beginning to make their presence felt in the markets of the world. Surely we cannot compete in world markets if we do not have the skilled technical people necessary to develop the products which are required, and surely those skills cannot be built up overnight.

The government has talked much about secondary industry. We well remember the speeches that were made about Canadian development and about the necessity of building up our secondary manufacturing. We do not want to be hewers of wood and drawers of water; we do not want to dig holes for Bomarc squadrons; we do not want to be relegated just to cutting down trees and bulldozing boulders out of the way. We want to take our part in the community of nations, and this is what the Prime Minister held out to the Canadian people.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Would the hon. gentleman, who is an authority on aeronautics, answer a couple of questions? The first question is, where in his estimation would markets be available for the CF-105? What explanation has he for the fact that in the United States the F-106C and the F-106D, of similar capabilities to the CF-105, had their contracts recently cancelled and production discontinued? I would like to have his opinion on that.

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Speaker, as far as the CF-105 is concerned I think there are innumerable possibilities if the government had gone after them. I am told that General—

Mr. Anderson: Mention one.

Mr. Hellyer: I am told that General Norstad has indicated an interest in having some of the CF-105's available for the Canadian air division in Europe.

Mr. Pearkes: To whom did he indicate that?

Mr. Anderson: That is not what C. D. Howe said.

Mr. Hellyer: We are told that General Norstad is interested. The government can tell us whether this is so or not. I heard over a week or two ago that the British were taking another look at the CF-105. Perhaps the government should have considered the possibility of trading some of the CF-105's for some British nuclear submarines. That would

[Mr. Hellyer.]

have encouraged and strengthened both the mother country and Canada. I am told that had we put them into squadron production we would ultimately have been able to sell them to several of the countries of the north Atlantic alliance.

Mr. Churchill: Who told you that?

Mr. Hellyer: If that is not so let the Prime Minister tell us, but that is the information we have.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I say right now that is not so.

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult to tell unless you do have them in squadron service and available, because a weapon in being is so much more important than some ethereal thing on the drawing board which may be in production some years hence.

Mr. Churchill: Give us your source of information.

Mr. Hellyer: As far as the other planes are concerned, I think we should stop comparing the United States F-106 with our CF-105. They are as different as a horse and buggy and a car. They were not designed to do the same job at all. They were for different military requirements. Perhaps one good reason why the United States should have cancelled their F-105 and F-106 is that they would have looked so poor beside the CF-105.

It is this aspect, Mr. Speaker, the loss of 20 years of accumulated productive capacity and potential, which is so serious. I have here an editorial from one of our independent newspapers entitled "The Beginning and the End". Someone wants to know the source. The newspaper is the *Toronto Globe and Mail*. I should like to read one or two paragraphs. The views expressed therein are identical with my own; therefore I am quite willing to assume responsibility for them. The editorial reads in part as follows:

And here is the irony of it. Most Canadians will recall that in the early post-war years we were not permitted to share defence production with the United States; the reason the United States gave being that we lacked the necessary know-how. So, at great trouble and cost, we acquired the know-how. Still, there was no sharing. And now, what? Now, the brilliant array of engineering and technical talent which built up this great Canadian industry will be dissipated. Now, these highly-trained men and women—the one national asset—will probably go. Where? To the United States.

This, Mr. Speaker, is a national tragedy. We are not alone on this side of the house in our view. We have some excellent support. I have here a speech prepared by the Minister of Labour for delivery later today