

One U.S. delegate noted that as far as U.S. troops in Europe are concerned, the recent development of large transport aircraft may make it possible for the U.S. to withdraw some of these troops from Europe and airlift them very rapidly to that continent should they be needed.

A Canadian delegate expressed deep concern about the attitude of the West German Government at this time. It seemed to be moving towards an attitude with respect to NATO similar to that of France.

One member of the U.S. delegation emphasized that when NATO was established, it had not been envisaged that the U.S. would supply the bulk of the ground forces but rather that the U.S. would provide strategic air and naval power with the European countries supplying the bulk of the ground troops. This has not worked out in practice.

It was emphasized that NATO was part of the total defense against the worldwide Soviet threat and the U.S. is required to maintain its strength not only in NATO but elsewhere. The NATO countries have been interested in arms reduction to bring about a detente and in weaning away some of the eastern European countries from central Communist domination. This was all to the good and NATO should be used to lessen global tensions. The U.S. interest in this was not only the interest in lessening global tension but to free U.S. military forces to accept responsibility elsewhere.

The U.S. delegation emphasized that while more could be done by NATO in the political field, the NATO countries should not be lulled into an unwarranted sense of security.

A member of the Canadian delegation mentioned that because of the nuclear stalemate existing in the world today the Soviet Union had shifted its approach and had concentrated on political and economic strategy. It was felt that if NATO remained exclusively military it would not be in a position to respond to much political or economic activity from the Soviet Union.

In closing this discussion, one member of the U.S. delegation said that a reduction of U.S. troop strength in Europe, which would be useful to the U.S. in carrying its world-wide responsibilities, might also be a meaningful gesture in the direction of a detente.

The U.S. Chairman opened the second session by suggesting a discussion of the North American Air Defense Agreement (NORAD). He recalled that the agreement expires on

May 12, 1968 and that it was desirable that there be an evaluation of the threat and the weapons available to meet that threat.

A Canadian delegate said that the Government of Canada made clear its intention to renew the Agreement but also made clear that it does not wish to participate in the ABM system.

A Canadian delegate mentioned that he was not opposed in principle to an anti-bomber defense system but questioned whether or not an active anti-bomber defense is warranted in terms of its financial cost. Quoting a recent speech by Secretary of Defense McNamara which mentioned that anti-bomber defense alone could not significantly reduce destruction if an attack occurred, it was mentioned that if such were the case Canada did not think that it could afford the continuation of such an anti-bomber defense system.

It was also pointed out by a Canadian delegate that the major defense of the American Continent was not any of the purely defense measures that are taken but rather the tremendous offensive power of the U.S. and that therefore an anti-bomber defense system might be quite obsolete in fact.

The members of the U.S. and Canadian delegations reiterated the view that the bomber threat from the Soviet Union continues to be an active threat against the North American continent and that a defense against this threat is as vital as defense against more sophisticated weaponry. Indeed, the U.S. had learned the lesson that a defense against more conventional weapons, in this case the manned bomber, was as important as a defense against more advanced threats.

In this discussion, the members of the U.S. delegation repeatedly emphasized that the U.S. would want Canada to exercise complete sovereignty over its territory; and that it would not wish in any way to impose on that sovereignty if Canada should choose to deny the use of its territory to the joint defense of the continent.

One Canadian delegate mentioned that the East Coast of Canada had no defense system to protect it against Soviet submarines and suggested that the NORAD Agreement might be modified to encompass not only air defense systems but also measures against sea and underwater threats. It was pointed out that although there have been in the recent past seven penetrations into Canadian controlled air space from Soviet bombers there was also