

*Firing of A.B.M. Warheads over Canada*

committee will make appropriate recommendations to this house. I hope their recommendations include suggestions that Canada remain in NATO and NORAD. I hope there will be no suggestion of any significant reduction in those two bodies. Any reductions in NORAD or NATO should coincide with similar reductions and effectiveness within the Warsaw pact alliance. Contrary to the relief of some of our flower-power advocates, the North Atlantic Treaty and NATO should be maintained and we, as a sovereign nation, should live up to our responsibilities in that regard.

● (11:50 p.m.)

When you look at the record militarily of Canada to this point, it is disturbing to note that since December, 1967, our contribution to NATO has been reduced to one army brigade in Europe, two full brigades at home, and one transportable brigade on tap in Canada. The air division has been reduced to six squadrons, running out through possible attrition in the early 1970's. We, as a nation, can afford more and should do more than that. Now, I wish to say something about NORAD, Mr. Speaker.

NORAD is the first two-nation military command to operate on this continent. Its 170,000 personnel at some 400 posts in the United States and Canada have been operating well, and the fact that it has not been called into action is the best reason for its existence. NORAD has worked on the theory that if you are powerful enough no potential enemy would start a conflict. Cuba may have been a reasonable example of that.

On reflection it should be pointed out that the United States and Canada began building up their defences after the outbreak of the Korean war in 1950. The decision was quickly made that co-operation, and co-operation only, was not enough; that what was really needed was a joint defence effort with complete co-ordination to meet the bomber threat of that time—bombers with increasing speeds and greater capacities to deliver lethal weapons with more accuracy.

Since its inception the system has undergone continuing review with respect to modernization, expansion and effectiveness. Antiquated radar systems, which covered only prime industrial targets, have been replaced with the most modern sensor equipment covering the entire continent. The need for this modernization was recognized with the advancement which had taken place in the

[Mr. Skoreyko.]

development of supersonic bombers, rocket ammunition and guided missiles.

The next requirement which was met was the need for information inflow which had to be accurate in respect of immediate identification. The volume of information required new and sophisticated computer systems which would analyse and advise NORAD. This was achieved by a system known as "SAGE". All members who have interested themselves in this aspect of our North American defence system know how well SAGE has functioned, even though information available to members of parliament is limited in scope and often very sketchy.

Today, the threat is not so much that of bomber attack, although I am sure the presence of bombers would be felt. The fact remains that initially the targets would be hit by I.C.B.M.'s and NORAD, I believe, has the facility to deal with these. Today, the threat looms greater in light of newer, more sophisticated intercontinental ballistic missiles.

There have been developments by some other great powers. China has now emerged as a new threat in the nuclear field, and what weaponry that nation may develop is as yet relatively unknown. The fact is that China becomes another valid reason why North American defences should be constantly upgraded, and I for one would gladly support the government in any action it would take to assist the United States in setting up such defences. I support the principle that security and freedom do not come cheaply and, within our ability to pay our contribution to North American defence, in co-operation with our greatest ally, should no longer be minimal.

I think that to some extent we in Canada are greedy people when we do not hesitate to lobby for our share of the defence dollar to be spent supporting our industries, but at the same time we offer only token support for our own defence, and indeed for our survival. This is grossly unfair.

I hold little or no brief for our so-called flower-power advocates who suggest that the United States should be denied air space over Canada. Such a view against North American defence is un-Canadian and indefensible. I am proud to be living next door to a great neighbour whom everyone knows has problems not dissimilar to ours with respect to poverty and urban blight. But the fact is that the United States has the courage to develop defensive techniques which are costly, indeed very costly. If my information is correct the new