

munists of economic resources, backed by their vast military strength, to exploit weaknesses and unrest throughout the world.

"Now, what are the measures that we can take to counter this threat which faces us? Certainly we would be mistaken if we thought for one moment that the only answer is greater military strength. However, I should like to deal first, by way of introduction, with the military aspect. The first implement which the West must have is a strong military force to deter war, and, to be adequate, it must be capable of waging war if war is forced upon us. Such military strength must include an effectively secure and sufficiently alert nuclear retaliatory striking force. As far as the free world is concerned, this nuclear striking force is concentrated in the United States at the bases of the Strategic Air Command... Other parts of this force are stationed at SAC bases spread throughout the world. More recently a whole new conception - what I would almost describe as a revolutionary conception - has been introduced, namely Polaris submarines, which can retaliate from the depths of the oceans.

"Let me make it perfectly clear that Canada does not contribute directly to the retaliatory forces, but we do assist in the warning and the protection of those forces based in the United States, by means of our radar lines, interceptor squadrons and our soon-to-be installed anti-bomber missile sites.

#### MOBILE SEA AND LAND FORCES

"By adequate military strength I also mean that the West must have forces which will include the means of controlling the seas, with emphasis on anti-submarine warfare. This is the role which has been assigned to the Royal Canadian Navy and we assist, along with our other NATO allies, in this task. The West must also have mobile forces, composed of land, sea and air elements suitably deployed and transportable, which are capable of deterring or coping with limited war situations. Along with this military strength must be a state of preparedness in the civilian community.

"It is obvious that a force of this kind cannot be built up and maintained by one nation. How often have we heard people ask: 'What is the point of a small country like Canada maintaining a defence force in an age when we cannot possibly compete with the great powers?' This, of course, is a sad case of mistaken judgement, because the great powers in the free world need us just as much as we need them. No country, not even the United States, can effectively defend itself alone. Defence has become a very complicated thing - don't let anyone tell you otherwise - and if the free world is to remain secure, it calls for the co-operation of all the nations that belong to it. That is why Canada, in conjunction with the other NATO countries, is pursuing its present defence policies. We recognize that we cannot build up a massive ICBM force,

nor do we want to do this. We recognize that we cannot afford a great fleet of nuclear submarines. We recognize that the means just do not exist in this country to build endless numbers of squadrons of interceptors. But we can make a meaningful contribution to a very large force which is made up of the ships, aircraft, missiles and ground forces contributed by all 15 countries of the NATO alliance.

#### ALLIANCE STRENGTH

"Another important element in our... security programme is the total strength of the alliances to which we belong. The security arrangements we have with other free nations enhance our own defence and, of course, the collective political and military posture of the whole democratic world. Sound political development and economic growth in these countries are necessary not only to counter the Communist threat but also to sustain the values and institutions of freedom. Therefore political wisdom and economic strength become basic elements in our security.

"The last point which I should like to mention (and it is perhaps one of the most important) is domestic support. By this I mean an understanding by the man in the street of the nature of the threat confronting us and what must be done to meet it.

"The whole defence situation has changed radically from what it was ten years ago. The vulnerability of the North American continent to direct attack, the ever-increasing cost of modern armaments, the urgency of the technological race, the emergence of the underdeveloped countries and the consequent increase in nationalism, are only a few of the problems which now confront policy-makers and the public. The situation has been altered not only by our own vulnerability but by the expansion of the means by which the Communist world threatens the West. It has become necessary to devote immense intellectual and material resources to problems other than the purely military threat which was the major concern some years ago.

#### UNSOOUND TRENDS OF CRITICISM

"I personally feel that it is extremely important for the general public to understand the issues at stake. I do not think these are nearly as well known and appreciated as they should be, and this is demonstrated by some of the major trends of criticism we have heard recently that are so unsound that they do cause real concern to those who are informed about defence matters. It is very easy to criticise, and I welcome it as it means that Canadians are thinking about defence, but that criticism should be constructive. Unfortunately, it is often based on very dangerous misconceptions.

"From time to time we hear individuals analyzing the threat as though it were nothing but a simple and obvious puzzle, and such

(Continued on P. 6)