Dec 22/51

Air defence requirements; Arrow aircraft (Previous reference Dec. 2)

shocked at the statement Air Marshal Slemon had made about the Arrow. It was not a question of whether Slemon's remarks had been misinterpreted or not but whether he should have made a statement of that kind at all. Avro had put on a tremendous publicity campaign and this played right into their hands. If the government decided to continue development it would be accused of giving in to a powerful lobby. Pressure was coming from other sources in Ontario too. Even if he thought the decision reached last September was wrong, he was determined, because of what had happened since, to adhere firmly to it. The future of the CF-105 would have to be discussed before Parliament opened.

out that it was still his understanding that development would be terminated by March 3lst. In Paris, the U.S. Secretary of Defence had made it quite clear that the U.S. was not interested in the CF-105, even if it were equipped with the MAI fire control system and the Falcon missile. The U.S. had now decided not to proceed with the development of any new interceptor aircraft except for the 108 which was years in the future. This was a long range aircraft of advanced design to be employed from bases in Alaska and Greenland. This U.S. decision would strengthen the government's position in deciding to abandon the CF-105.

WHY? THEY WERE GOING TO PICCOVICE A LONG-RANGE INTERCEPTOR IN THE

Prime Minister and the Minister of National Defence on the situation regarding the CF-105 and agreed that a decision be reached on the aircraft's future before Parliament re-opened.

As reproduced from photocopies of released Cabinet minutes in Arrow Scrapbook.

V.S. PARIS CONT.

REF. V.S. SEC. DEF: VSA

NOT INTERESTED IN

ANY ARROW.

IT IS NEVER SHOWN

THAT USAF HAD

ASKED FOR ARROW

PROPOSILS - 4 HAD

SEEN THE ARROW 3, 4 + PS-2

VERSIONS.