

NORAD—Canada-U.S. Agreement

use a weapon that can involve everybody in destruction is bound to impose some strain on and create uneasiness—

He dealt with that and finally said:

There is a second and related question. On what basis will the decision be made . . . for retaliation?

He deals with that at some length and comes to the conclusion that this indeed is one of those problems that are of paramount importance in the modern world. Today we in North America find ourselves in this position. While Canada and the United States have endeavoured to bring about a lessening of the fear that hangs over all of us, we in Canada, because of our position with the U.S.S.R. as our northern neighbour and the United States of America to the south, have endeavoured and are continuing in our endeavour to bring about a realization on the part of the U.S.S.R. and those associated with the Soviet union that it is necessary to bring about disarmament. As a preliminary step in that direction and as part of the general picture there should be areas in all parts of the world, if necessary, and provided the U.S.S.R. is agreeable, set apart for inspection either by the U.S.S.R. or ourselves to the end that the dread fear of sudden and unprovoked attack shall be removed from the hearts of men in the western hemisphere and in the U.S.S.R., in the event that similar fears are held there.

But the Arctic peril remains. At the United Nations the U.S.S.R. exercised its eighty-third veto to prevent the proposal put forward there recently from being adopted. Today we find ourselves in the position, as described by one writer, that what took place at the United Nations changed none of the facts of the world situation. Mr. Max Freedman put the matter in these words:

Peace continues to rest on the uneasy race between fear and hate. Over the distant northern reaches of this continent, once strange to geography and until recently unknown to history, there still broods the peril of military conflict.

In order to meet the situation, action had to be taken. It was realized by the former government that action was necessary. When this government came into power just a year ago we followed in its steps with respect to the stand taken by it on behalf of Canada, believing, as we repeatedly reiterated during our days in opposition, that the aim and purpose of members of the house were to endeavour to attain that measure of unity in external affairs which would assure a united front on the part of the people of Canada. We supported the stands that were taken throughout the years on every such matter that came before the house. We placed before the house, as I expect the opposition to do today, suggestions that in our opinion would be beneficial.

Defence lines were established in northern Canada, but today the vital Canadian warning stations are dependent upon human intervention for their operation. Electronic equipment governs the detection of approaching aircraft and the navigation of the interceptors, but the connecting link is still human compulsion. We face today the problem of overcoming the danger that faces us and of establishing semi-automatic ground equipment in addition to the defence lines that were established. This course represents the wisdom of necessity.

Throughout the years, while the opposition was in power, these matters received their attention but there was one major difficulty. Within Canada there were those, perhaps small in number, who felt that Canadians might be able to maintain their own defences. On the other hand, the majority followed the leadership of the last government in the view it undertook to implement, whereby it was necessary to establish a system of integrated air defence as between our country and the United States.

Ever since 1951 it has been recognized that the air defence of Canada and the United States must be considered as a single problem. Arrangements between the two countries at that time provided only for the co-ordination of separate air defence plans and did not provide authority for joint action to be employed against any aggressor. With the advent of nuclear weapons and the technological advances that assure the very rapid rate of delivery of such weapons, quick decisions require to be made in order to maintain the effectiveness of our defence. As time would be inadequate after a sudden attack to determine such plans it was obviously necessary to have in existence in peacetime an organization, including weapons, facilities and command structure, which could operate at the outset of hostilities, these facilities to be provided in advance by the national authorities concerned.

I say that in recent years this matter has received consideration. I bring to your attention, sir, the steps in the development of integration of operational control of Canadian and continental United States air defence forces in peacetime going back to May 14, 1956, when the Canadian chiefs of staff and the United States joint chiefs of staff agreed to refer to the joint study group the integration of operational control of the continental air defence of Canada and the United States in peacetime. These deliberations continued and the then minister of national defence, Hon. Ralph Campney, on behalf of the then government outlined those considerations which were acceptable to the United States and Canada.