

Readers' Views on Arrow and Defense

I was bitterly disappointed to learn that our Government abandoned the Arrow project. It is my humble opinion that no mechanical device will ever substitute for the versatility of a manned interceptor. Ground-to-air missiles can do the job of the anti-aircraft artillery and an air-minded Canada could hardly accept these sitting ducks in exchange for the flying Arrows.

Under the circumstances, however, I hope that until 1962 nothing will happen that would prove me right.

Welland.

Nicholas Novak.

I read your editorial on the CF-105 and heartily concur. The present Government has completely misrepresented themselves to the public in their "Canada for Canadians" platform. The loss of our political and economic freedom will surely follow if the combined voices of the Canadian people are not raised against such befuddled planning and management.

The newspaper certainly is an important part of any effort put forth in the development of this country, politically or economically, and I hope your editorial starts some of our people thinking.

Fruitland.

Fred G. Harris.

Regardless of the merits, or otherwise, of maintaining the Avro Arrow in production, the way in which the announcement was made, with no prior advice to the company regarding the timing of it so that they could arrange a gradual layoff and cushion the shock to the workers, and with no alternative work to offer, seems like a callous disregard of human welfare.

Thousands of people, with families, some of whom have all their savings invested in mortgaged homes, are faced with the bleak and demoralizing prospect of hunting jobs in a glutted labor market. If this denotes a "courageous and realistic" attitude, perhaps we should re-assess our values.

Sudbury.

D. W. Ward.

In the closing of Avro, don't you consider that the company itself might have used greater ingenuity and initiative in creating other lines to sell rather than to depend on the Government for all its support and keep? Has the company no responsibility for this? The notice hasn't been so sudden, regardless of the impression you and Mr. Crawford Gordon are trying to give.

Do you, along with a lot of business people, think that the Government should run the businesses and/or at least get them out of all their troubles? We may be a dull people, but surely in your capacity you have a greater opportunity to offer leadership in the right and proper thinking and expression.

Toronto.

Grace Penfold.

When the noise of battle has ceased and the Arrow is finally buried, on whom will history lay the blame? The Liberals and C. D. Howe? The Conservatives and Mr. Diefenbaker? The Avro complexity? Probably none of these. The real fault lies in Canada's gross political immaturity. History will show that, once again, Canada was taken for a good-old ride—American style.

In 1951 Canada had developed two outstanding aircraft at the Malton plant—the CF-100 and the Jetliner. In the United States the main aircraft producers were committed to a program of building up Strategic Air Command. Their engineering and financial resources could not be spared for the development of civil jet airliners. Canada's position in 1951 was that of being on the threshold of world leadership in the production of a civil jet airliner. In Britain, the pioneer De Havilland Comet was about to suffer a series of disasters which would delay that program by a number of years—years in which leadership could be strengthened and increased.

But pressure from vast United States interests coerced the Liberal Government into following a parallel course and developing the Arrow and Iroquois engine at the expense of the Jetliner. Thus, there would be no "unfair" competition in the civil field from across the

border. As the demands of SAC were reduced by the advent of the missile, the Boeing and Douglas firms commenced production of civilian counterparts to their bombers, on which all the preliminary experiments had been paid for by the American taxpayer. Meanwhile, in Canada the dawn of realization slowly broke upon her politicians. At last the decision could no longer be delayed—and 14,000 workers lost their jobs.

There must be some really hearty laughter from those members of the American interests who created the situation in 1951—particularly as the Avro Arrow cannot be developed into a civilian aircraft.

Dublin, Ont.

K. G. Oldacre.

Surely all thinking Canadians realize that unless we can prevent the tragic irresponsible blundering that has resulted from the cancellation of the Avro Arrow contract, then we shall not long survive as an independent nation. The Communist societies do not make this sort of mistake.

I am not questioning the Government's decision either for or against the Arrow: that decision is the duty of the Government. What is agonizingly wrong is the lack of continuity of thinking and responsibility from one Government to the next. If we as a nation have once decided that we shall employ our economy to build up our own defenses (and we wouldn't be a nation had we decided otherwise), then this decision is not reversible. Any politician who thinks that we can change our minds on this point just does not know his business.

The actions of our past Governments created Avro together with all the complications inherent in its existence. Then Avro must not be torn apart. Our Government is apparently so confused with the chatter of "freedom of enterprise" that it behaves like the leader of the country one day, and like a private buyer the next; and on the day when it acts like a private buyer, we lose our leadership.

A man like Mr. Crawford Gordon in control of a complex organization can make literally anything, given money and time. We have both—more money than time, I would estimate. Obviously the Government could ask Mr. Gordon to change direction and make a new product, but this manoeuvre is not put in hand by collapsing the organization. During the Second World War, the British Government went to my company in England and said: "We don't want you to print beer labels any more; we want you to make airplane wings right here in your printing plant." No one was laid off, and the plant, together with thousands of others, was converted, and Great Britain seems to have survived.

Why wasn't this done at Malton? Our Government is responsible for Malton. Ordinary people need not be confused with the talk of money. We can do anything we have a mind to do. Men's minds are masters—not money. Where is the Great Vision now?

Leaside.

R. F. Chittenden.

Avro workers are not unnaturally kicking over this layoff in spite of the fact that they were warned and have at least worked through the winter. If the Government—that is, the people—can use \$55,000,000 of the money collected in taxes to keep 13,000 people employed, surely it would not be unreasonable to expect the people to raise in taxes this year nearly four times that amount and keep the 48,000 now unemployed in clover next winter.

Obviously what the Avro workers want is nationalization of industry, assured jobs and no unemployment. The building trade would no doubt like to work a full year instead of from April to October, and if one trade has Government assistance why not another? Every worker pays taxes, and perhaps workers other than those at Avro would like their tax money diverted to help their trades, too.

Instead of thanking Mr. Diefenbaker for the \$55,000,000 which kept them employed while others existed in forced idleness, Avro workers are trying to blame Mr. Diefenbaker for a sudden blow when in reality this was discussed last year and was as inevitable as the terrible winter the unemployed have lived through this year.

Richvale.

D. Scott.