

Labour Crisis in Aircraft Industry

which did not bear out the press statement quotation. I also said I had denied it to the press a day or two after it appeared and the Prime Minister accepted my word on that occasion and now he is dragging it up again.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I notice there were no denials at the time.

Mr. Pearson: There was a denial at the time, Mr. Speaker, as I have just said.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Well, I am reading from the Canadian Press again as reported in the *Ottawa Journal* of that day:

He said the Conservative government should have cancelled the Arrow production order this fall instead of waiting until next spring. How much is going to be spent on the Arrow between now and then?

The hon. gentleman now says—and naturally I accept his denial—

Mr. Pearson: On a point of order I said it on January 19 last and the Prime Minister accepted it then and he had better accept it now.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I must necessarily accept it and of course I do, but I still refer to the fact that the Canadian Press carried that story and one or two other newspapers.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. When one hon. gentleman rises in his place, as the Leader of the Opposition did some weeks ago, and denies a statement, under our rules it is not open to any hon. member, by any device whatsoever, to refuse to accept the statement of an hon. member who speaks against an alleged statement, and the Prime Minister is now resorting for the second time to a course which is a violation of the rules of the house.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, possibly I might read another portion of that and see whether or not it too is denied:

Liberal Leader Pearson, speaking to the Liberal association of Alberta, urged a thorough re-examination of Canada's defence policy and its economic implications. He suggested Canada may be getting in too deep.

Does he deny saying that?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I do not deny that at all. Under this government we are getting in too deep.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, the only definition that I can give to the expression that Canada is getting in too deep is that expenditures such as the CF-105 represent too great a contribution to one phase of defence and place Canada in a position where it cannot properly discharge its responsibilities otherwise. I go further. As he spoke this afternoon he made much of United States

influence. How he spoke of it in those lachrymose tones. Well, he said that we had never had anything like this before.

Mr. Pearson: Quite true.

Mr. Diefenbaker: In fact, since we heard him this afternoon he said the same thing over the national radio. I got the speech twice, once this afternoon and again this evening and he went on to say that never before had there been anything like this cost-sharing of the Bomarc. It is not heard of: This is mutual aid. You remember those words. How foreign it was to him that the United States should be spending money in Canada or sharing in our defence. Well, sir, in building the D.E.W. line they did not share with us; they paid it all. Did it shock the sensibilities of those hon. gentlemen then, when the United States came into Canada and instead of Canada participating in her own defence and paying the costs of this line for radar defence, the United States paid it all? But, then, he went on to say that this thing had never been heard of before. We have got to put a stop to it. On the Pinetree line the distribution of expenditures as between Canada and the United States is exactly the same percentage as it is in connection with Bomarc.

I wonder why statements such as these should be made, why there should be such shock exhibited on the part of the Leader of the Opposition who referred to this outrageous thing, the United States coming into Canada and contributing by way of mutual aid. This has been the course followed during the last several years, during the period when he was a minister of the crown.

Having cleared away some of this underbrush, may I now proceed to say something more. It is interesting to see his attitude with respect to the CF-105 and the cancellation of this project. He did not say what he was reported to have said at Edmonton to the Liberal association but, I call witnesses on this behalf respecting the tremendous change that has taken place in the last two years, the technical revolution, the like of which has never taken place in the history of mankind. In the intervening years since the CF-105 was first considered on the drawing table we have had the sputnik and the lutnik. We have also had the ICBM. We have had tremendous changes in the last few years. The hon. member for Trinity referred to the fact that it is 50 years ago today that the Silver Dart was flown, the first flight within what is now the British commonwealth of nations. There have been tremendous changes in those 50 years, but nothing like the changes in the last few years.

[Mr. Pearson.]