

Readers' Views on the Scrapping of the Avro Arrow

Would the Canadian people contribute to a fund to support Avro? If bonds were issued, would they buy them? From the reaction to its closing, I believe they would.

Toronto.

Lilian S. North.

What happened in this country today (February 20) is almost astounding. It is not the fact that A. V. Roe was making aircraft, nor is it because A. V. Roe originally is an English company. The important fact is that A. V. Roe was producing a product designed and constructed in Canada.

Today, Mr. John Diefenbaker told the people of Canada to stick to farming and to let someone else attend to industrial development.

Whitby.

H. F. MacKay.

Your front page editorial, The Beginning—and the End, annoyed me. Perhaps our CF-100 was the "beginning", but it was soundly denounced by Lieut-Gen. Guy Simonds, et al. In fact, dear General Simonds lost his job for stating his sensible viewpoint—and it wasn't under the Conservative Government that he quit. The McGill Review, My Fur Lady, ridiculed the CF-100.

The other side of the present picture is comparable to The Coming of the New Deal, by Schlesinger about decisions made by F. D. Roosevelt. He (Roosevelt) certainly fulfilled his country's hopes regardless of criticism because he tried to do what was sensible and right for all. I'll back Diefenbaker. Surely there will be something important for each unemployed to do for the country he loves.

Parry Sound.

(Mrs.) H. C. Laird.

Seeing that a decision has been made to reduce military expenditure by discontinuing the production of the Avro Arrow, is it not possible, with all the science and resources available, to have the company construct a fleet of planes for ordinary civilian travel and as freight carriers?

If Canadians had an opportunity to visit other countries at a reasonable price without damaging other competitive airlines, they would probably be very happy to know they were helping to rehabilitate our country.

The program often talked of, to raise the living standards of other peoples, is still waiting to be put into operation. Now is the time for bold imagination on the part of private enterprise in co-operation with our Government. The world is waiting for economic development of the right kind in peaceful co-existence. Let the company which manufactured the Arrow re-tool and keep the men employed and on the Government payroll if necessary. Canada cannot afford to let thousands of our citizens suffer without offering some hope of a future for their skill and talents. Peace must triumph over war. Let us be realistic and positive. Let us venture together into the era of a world without war by building planes for peaceful purposes.

Ottawa.

Mrs. Edith Holtom.

Congratulations on today's (February 21) editorial regarding the Avro Arrow. We have already heard and read many comments about the Arrow, but I feel the most important facts have not been considered, which can be summarized as follows:

1. The statement that pilot-guided airplanes are obsolete is challenged by top military specialists in both the United Kingdom and the United States. That our defense is better served by buying the Bomarc is open to serious question. The 200-mile range and the large vulnerable launching bases of the Bomarc can hardly make anyone believe that it can contribute in any way to the defense of Canada.

2. If any defense of Canada is possible, our Government should first investigate thoroughly all potential defense weapons, before spending good tax dollars on a weapon which in any case will be outdated before very long. I think I am not presuming when I say that no military defense can be found, and in any war between the U.S.A. and the USSR, Canada will be the battlefield.

3. We must realize that natural resources alone do not give the guarantee of richness for

a nation. We require also the industrial plants to process these materials, together with skilled labor, experienced engineers, and industrialists having confidence in this country. Avro is a perfect example of an industry where this teamwork resulted in the production of a world-leading product. Our future in world markets depends on products of this type.

We are paying millions of tax dollars to support farm exports; we are opening our borders to import industrial goods from countries with a 10-times cheaper labor force and even higher productivity. This is certainly not the environment in which industry can grow and our nation with it. Let us hope that February 20 will not be a tragic date in Canada's history.

Don Mills.

Arnold Simoni.

The RCAF is finished as a fighting unit. This is the implication of the Prime Minister's statement on cancellation of the Arrow. The manned interceptor is not finished according to the leading military experts, and the USAF has a long-range, supersonic interceptor under development, for service in 1963. If Canada does not have interceptors of her own it seems likely that the intention is to base the American F-108 in Canada. Maybe we have to be defended by the USAF, but if this is the intention we should be told now.

Mr. Diefenbaker's presentation of the facts leads one to feel that the Bomarc is a defense against missile attack. This is not the case at all; the Bomarc is an anti-aircraft weapon. It is only slightly faster than the Arrow and has less range. Furthermore, it cannot be used to "investigate" an intruder.

If taken literally, the Prime Minister's statement says that our anti-aircraft defense is to be Bomarcs only, and no defense at all against missiles. This simply cannot be the whole story; interceptors come into the picture somewhere.

I am a little bit ashamed of expressing so dark a thought, but it looks as if the interceptor problem is being deliberately overlooked now, to be brought up later when the Arrow is really dead and the F-108 is approaching the flight-testing stage.

Islington.

Sherman Gauley.

As one interested in the future of technically skilled men in Canada, might I add a few words to the many written about the Arrow dispute. My qualifications for doing this include an M.A. in physics from the University of Toronto and a Canadian pilot's license.

Recently you, in company with other Canadian newspapers, deplored the lack of scientific talent being exploited in Canada and noted that many of our trained personnel

were crossing the border. This is an unfortunate fact and it is also a fact that there are very few establishments in Canada outside of the universities employing large groups of men trained in scientific research. Of these, the biggest industrial concern is, of course, A. V. Roe Canada Ltd., the producer of the Arrow.

Sufficient facts have been presented, in your columns and elsewhere, to show that Canada may benefit and certainly will not lose economically, militarily (possibly excepting politically), by buying our home-grown product. Is it too much to ask, then, that we buy Canadian and keep intact the top-notch group that has been assembled at Malton? There are many, like myself, who wish to repay the country that trained us, but we haven't a snowball's chance if our scientific teams are cut and scattered. Must we cross the border as well?

J. S. M. Harvey.

Merton College, Oxford, England.

The CCF, Liberals and unions have, with your paper, made a great shout about the Government's decision to stop wasting more of the taxpayers' money by scrapping the Arrow aircraft, which has taken seven years from drawing board to production of finished product, with still more modifications needed as time goes on, which adds to the cost. But was there ever a word said when the unions stopped numerous enterprises for periods of months, and in one or two cases of over a year? Did they shout about the unemployment then, when through no fault of supplier companies their employees were thrown out of work—but still had to pay union dues?

You also say that it means money flowing over the border to buy the equipment for defense; but have you stopped to think of the millions of dollars that flow across the border every year in union funds that keep the big bosses of the unions in huge salaries?

The Arrow was obsolete even before it went on the assembly block. Why don't they experiment with the atom as did the United States and Britain? With their submarines they might then achieve something more in line with modern times and the near future when everything will be in the nuclear age.

Toronto.

A. Matthew.

On the eve of the 50th anniversary of flight in Canada the Canadian aircraft industry has been delivered a set-back from which it is doubtful it will ever recover. Prime Minister Diefenbaker's abrupt cancellation of the Arrow program, coupled with his statement that no substitute work is forthcoming for Avro's employees, will break up a fine design team and make us entirely dependent on the U.S. for our defense needs.

It was this same design team and facilities which produced the CF-100, an aircraft which is still the most effective interceptor NATO has, while more sophisticated and faster aircraft have come and gone. If the Arrow had been placed into production I feel it, too, would have given the same service and effective defense life for the next 10 years as the CF-100 has for the last five to 10 years.

That interceptor aircraft are not obsolete is borne out by the statement by Britain's Air Secretary George Ward. He states the age of the interceptor is far from over and that Britain will commence to replace her Canberra aircraft with new up-to-date Valiant, Vulcan and Victor aircraft. Also Aviation Week, an authoritative journal on aviation and missile work, states that England will put her P-1 Lightning aircraft in production. This aircraft is an interceptor. It also states that English officials feel the interceptor will have a useful life of 10 years.

Considering Canada's huge defense expenditures, the fact that no work for Avro is contemplated is inexcusable. It can only result in the export of many engineers and technologists to the U.S. and the return to the U.K. of a large number of first-rate immigrants; the type which we have long maintained we need badly. These men have no alternative and their return will not enhance Canada's reputation as a land of opportunity.

Toronto.

F. W. Mason.

globe mail