

*Supply—National Defence*

that bombers will have to be intercepted farther out than ever if the interception is to be effective. We are told that the F-108 may be able to do this; certainly the CF-100 will not be able to do it. I repeat; are we therefore to have in the future, if we are to maintain this kind of defence, United States squadrons of F-108's flying from Canadian bases as our main protection, or are we to have Bomarc's, or are we to have both on Canadian soil?

That leads me to the consideration of this very important and controversial missile, the Bomarc. What about this ground to air missile on which we seem to be basing our defence now? A year ago, I agree the reports which reached us of the effectiveness of the Bomarc were much more impressive than they seem to be now in the light of all the information which has come from the congressional hearings in Washington. Certainly they are more effective than CF-100 against supersonic bombers, because I doubt if the CF-100 would be effective at all.

Doubts have been raised as to the effectiveness of this missile upon which we in Canada are now counting so much. There is—and perhaps this is not too strong a word—a furious controversy going on in Washington over these missiles. There is a controversy between the use of the Nike-Ajax and the Nike-Hercules which the army has at the moment, and the Bomarc B which is the choice of the air force and which is Canada's choice. But before I go on to discuss those missiles let me emphasize once again that neither of them, the Nike nor the Bomarc, has any value whatever against missiles. The evidence on that is conclusive. I made that statement this morning, Mr. Chairman, and I propose to substantiate it from evidence in Washington where they have the facts on this matter. One of the high officials of the Pentagon, General Partridge, testified before the house of representatives subcommittee, again on February 19, 1959. He was asked by a congressman:

As of the moment you do not have any defence against ICBM's if Russia should have them and apply them to us at the moment?

General Partridge: That is correct.

The congressman went on:

The only way that you could protect yourself under those conditions would be by having a knowledge through intelligence as to when they are going to be fired, and only then, if you had adequate devices to knock them down?

General Partridge: That is right.

Later in the same hearing General Partridge had this to say:

The present system of air defence as it exists today has no capability to provide either warning or active defence against an incoming intercontinental ballistic missile.

Then he went on, and the minister echoed this this morning:

This system must be devised; the warning portion is now being built. The active missile defences, the Nike-Zeus system must be pushed along to completion as rapidly as possible.

Then a congressman asked:

Is it true since that has not been tried out we do not know what it would do?

General Partridge replied:

Work is proceeding on the development equipment, research and development equipment, and it will be tested, I believe, at White Sands proving ground.

From this evidence it becomes very clear that it will be some years before these anti-missile missiles can possibly be effective, and they will cost billions, of course far beyond our financial reach if we ever get involved in this field by ourselves. Even then there are some doubts as to the ultimate effectiveness of this anti-missile missile. The assistant secretary of the air force research and development branch, Mr. Horner, testifying again on February 19, said:

It appears to be much cheaper to launch an ICBM than it is to shoot one down.

Then he was asked by the chairman of the subcommittee:

As I understand it, you are saying that the Nike-Zeus and other suggested ways of shooting down ballistic missiles would be so expensive that probably the better answer to the threat is the production of more ICBM's by the United States as an additional threat and deterrent against the opponent. Is that correct?

Mr. Horner replied:

Yes, sir, that is correct.

Then he was asked to give an estimate as to the effectiveness of this missile if they did proceed with it, and Mr. Horner said:

My reaction to that is that the defence has never been 100 per cent successful. With this tremendous advantage that the offence now has with the advent of thermonuclear weapons and ballistic missiles, it certainly becomes even more difficult to postulate 100 per cent success in defence and interception.

The conclusion of this, Mr. Chairman, and surely it has a bearing on our own policy, is that at present there is no defence against missiles, that it will be some years before any defence against them will be operational, and there is not likely ever to be complete defence against nuclear missiles.

Then what about the other form of defence which, according to some, is the best defence against the more immediate threat? What about missile defence against bombing planes? That brings up, of course, the controversy between the Nike and the Bomarc. The Nike, as the minister pointed out this morning, is an army short range, but operational, ground