

Press Views on the Arrow and Defense

Sarnia Observer

Modern warfare is too costly for nations of Canada's stature to play around with. Whether we like it or not we are going to be compelled to let the United States carry most of the load. That nation has the money. If they run short of talent there is plenty of it in Canada.

St. Catharines Standard

It is to be hoped that in the line of defense the Government will not overlook the necessity of enlarged mobile forces. We have already relieved American personnel along the DEW line. We should extend this program to control Canadian territory to the Arctic and to protect Canadian territorial sovereignty.

Montreal Gazette

The Arrow program will probably be debated for years, but its termination does not mean poor Canadian production; what it does stress is a lack of co-operative defense planning. This is the immediate requirement, a North American production schedule which gives Canada her justified share of the defense dollar.

London Free Press

The Diefenbaker Government has acted wisely in deciding to pay Avro \$100,000,000 and discontinue work on the controversial Arrow. Whatever may have been the merits of the plane, or of decisions reached earlier, it has undoubtedly been overtaken by events.

Had the Americans, or some other allies, been willing to use some of the aircraft and so share the cost it might have been feasible to continue. Now there is no prospect of any such help, and the Canadian public can hardly be expected to pay hundreds of millions of dollars for a plane which is obsolete before it is in production.

Guelph Daily Mercury

The United States has spoken of its dependence to a considerable degree in the case of war. But why should Canadian taxpayers pay another country—the United States—for its defense weapons? Canada has the equipment, the manpower to manufacture such weapons of defense. Why should we be forced to send our own money south of the border for this purpose while our own experts who planned and built the Arrow are drawing unemployment insurance because we received no financial assistance from the United States?

General Foulkes in Ottawa outlined a policy for sharing defense production between Canada and the United States. This is now imperative in view of what has happened to the Arrow.

Hamilton Spectator

The Arrow decision, much as it means to Canadian industry and particularly to this area, is embraced in an important step toward complete co-ordination of North American air defense. Viewed in the light of NORAD and Colorado Springs it was inevitable either that the Americans should accept the Arrow or that we should reject it. It may be more difficult to accept the wisdom of the joint decision without question.

We would like to know whether any manned aircraft is being contemplated for the re-equipment of RCAF squadrons in Europe and Canada and who will produce it. Nor are we unreservedly grateful for American generosity in bearing such a large part of the cost of the Bomarc missile until we have more information on the extent to which our big partner is going to allow Canadian participation in the whole defense production program.

Ottawa Journal

It is now apparent that we are being completely integrated with the United States defense system, not only integrated but dependent upon it.

The Prime Minister said that agreement in principle has been reached with the United States on sharing costs of the defense program and that the Government expects that

"a reasonable and fair share" of the defense production will be allocated to Canadian industry.

Our national stature and pride demands that we give not only missile sites and airfields and transport facilities but that we have an active share in planning and in provision of equipment.

Production-sharing must not mean only that the crumbs from the U.S. industrial table come to Canada's industry.

Windsor Daily Star

The (Arrow) program, commenced by the Liberal Government and carried on since June, 1957, by the Conservative Government, proved one thing. A nation of our population just can't compete with the Great Powers in production of expensive defense weapons. This is especially so when such equipment often is really obsolete even before it gets off the drawing boards.

Cessation of the program, however, doesn't settle the overall problem of defense equipment. Canada still has need of it. We must buy it if we can't afford to make it, purchase often being cheaper than domestic manufacture. If we buy all, or most of it, from the United States it still will be a tremendous burden on our economy. The answer is in integration of the defense production of the United States and Canada.

Calgary Herald

The decision to end production of the Arrow supersonic jet interceptor is a decision of political courage, and one which can only hearten those who are expecting the Government to give some leadership as far as combating inflation in this country is concerned.

The only consideration the Government had to give was to the importance of the Arrow to national safety. It was decided, according to Prime Minister Diefenbaker, that the time had passed the plane. In other words, it was no longer an important factor in an age of missiles.

What was the alternative? It was to spend millions in an already inflated economy to produce an aircraft that was next to useless for Canada's defense needs.

We have to face many problems in Canada and one of the most important is how to preserve our national sovereignty while at the same time being "integrated" with the United States defense system. It is a problem which is never clear cut.

Yet the decision to abandon the Arrow should, in the long run, strengthen the Canadian economy and that in itself is one of the important factors in preserving Canadian independence.

New Westminster British Columbian

The trend to emasculate Canada's armed forces and to hamstring Canadian technical ability has become dangerous. If there is more of this defeatism, the Canadian spirit will be crushed into jelly.

Prime Minister Diefenbaker said the U.S. will hand out the missiles for defense, also the nuclear weapons for the armed forces. The U.S. will get more bases in Canada. In other words, the U.S. will run our defense strategy and methods.

Co-operation in continental defense is logical, but Canada must play a prominent and efficient part. Canadians do not wish to be carrier boys for U.S. missilemen, or to be the last to get weapons from the U.S. stockpile.

Defense of Canada is not in weapons alone, but in the heart, initiative and fighting spirit of Canadian manpower. If these are denatured, we become zombies. The sooner the Government snaps out of the Black Friday slump and infuses steel and fire into the backbone of Canadianism, the sooner we can lift our heads from the shame of passive defeatism.

Let us never forget that Canadian sovereignty must rule every square inch of Canada; that our technical genius must be used to the full in research and industry; that our armed forces must be of appropriate strength and second to none; and that Canadian morale must be blasted out of the quagmire of mere civil defense survival into the fire of fighting for freedom.

globe & mail