

Feb 28. 1959

The Government has been systematically downgrading the performance of the CF-105, presumably to justify use of Bomarc's. And to chop down the Arrow when the sixth one was almost ready with Iroquois engines for its first test flight! Was Washington pulling a switch to disintegrate the Arrow program? I cannot believe Defense Minister Pearkes' statement the Arrow's range is only 300 and some miles.

Will one of the engineering or designing team of the Arrow straighten out a confused and ignorant public? Talk about performance is futile until we have facts. Why was it that up to Avro's Black Friday we were led to believe Arrow's range was 1,500 to 2,000 miles?

Judging from the records set by the U.S. F-104 of over 1,400 mph plus 91,000 ft. high flight, I see no reason to doubt Arrow could eventually fly much faster and higher. The Mark II should exceed 2,000 mph at 100,000 ft. One has only to look at the record of the Orenda engine to see consistent and substantial improvement.

The Iroquois engine could be improved so that in three or four years CF-105 could match the F-108 which we do not want to see over our land. Get Arrow into production fast while Avro plans its rocket-driven successor — for the U.S. X-15 is the forerunner of the rocket interceptor.

The roles of manned interceptors may change but where man-made objects go man will follow, whether it is a turbo-jet Mach. 3 rocket launcher, a rocket-driven hypersonic stratosphere, an orbital controlled satellite, or a space ship. Instruments do a good job and with man's brain to watch them, make decisions and plan ahead, they would do much better.

Government made a blunder

in the Arrow cancellation. Russia has in production the Bounder, a bomber capable of Mach. 3 speeds.

Any product has to prove itself. We should not have tried to sell Arrow to other countries until it had proved itself the best.

K. E. WEBER

The furor over the termination of Arrow seems unjustified.

Did Ontario shed tears when the Springhill, N.S., mine was forced to close, or other factories that recently have had to discontinue, due to lack of business?

Avro knew of the cancellation possibility, yet did nothing to seek other work.

As for Government selling out to U.S., the Liberals years ago wanted a reciprocity treaty which would have meant closing some U.S. plants here.

How many of those who urge Canada-made goods fail to cross to Buffalo and come back with goods that they could have bought here?

Only a few years ago there were no unemployment cheques to be had week by week.

GORDON MANNING

Stoney Creek.

Here are some questions concerning Arrow. We have paid some \$400,000,000 to develop it—are we not to see tests reports that would have been made prior to March 31? Is it true that for little more than the cancellation costs we could have had the 37 Arrows contracted for? Did Arrow on the day before Black Friday, break the world speed record by hundreds of miles an hour even without our vastly superior engines? Is animosity between Mr. Diefenbaker and Avro president Gordon partly responsible for the former's courageous decision?

Are Britain, U.S. and France still producing and developing manned interceptors? Is it true that our magnificent Arrow program would have cost no more than previous years' expenditures for the CF-100? Was Avro figuring on selling

300 Iroquois engines to the French air force?

These, and many others, are rumors one hears.

PHILIP JACKSON

What are all our leaders thinking about when we permit the Avro fiasco?

Canada does not seem to have the initiative or intestinal fortitude to design, develop and construct all the implements of modern defense, apace with U.S. programs.

Why? I am certain that the best engineers to be found in U.S. come from Canada or some other country. Over recent years this type of immigration to the U.S. has been and still is very high.

Forty years ago the Russians had little save starvation. Since War I they have racked up astonishing accomplishments and I am sure the USSR is not dependant on U.S. for missiles or any parts of them. Why should we be?

The U.S. withholds custody of A-war heads, so why should we buy their missiles?

The atomic bomb, the original U.S. Manhattan project, was undoubtedly the work of a vast field of international scientists — preponderantly not American. It is out of all reason to believe it is an exclusive product of U.S. know-how, to which so many lands contributed.

If USSR can accomplish so much in 40-odd years, we in Canada can surely do better. We supplied U.S. with a tremendous percentage of its raw materials, including uranium. They have coaxed and in some cases pirated engineers, technicians and trained personnel from Canada for years.

It is time we produce our own defense weapons, including the A-bomb, if we have to.

It is a disgrace to have a Government that allocated \$50 million to cushion the closedown of our largest aircraft plant and its subcontractors. What we want is a Government to allocate this money from what we do not need to what we do—missiles.

We want a stepup, not a gradual closedown. Up, Canada, let's make all our needs ourselves! W. G. WHITTES