Canadian **Aviation**

Volume 31, Number 12 • February 1958

editorial

Perspective Is Essential For an Over-all Defense

There are dangers to perspective in the recent flurry over East vs. West superiority in the missiles field.

There have been a variety of estimates on Russia's capabilities, with the weight of opinion, expert and otherwise, giving the USSR the nod over U. S. in at least the ICBM field.

At least we're pretty sure they have the lead . . . after all Sputnik 1 . . . and then the dog . . . but perhaps they can't . . . but they must be able to . . !

You can still pick your side of the fence and hope on missiles; maybe they have and maybe they haven't.

But there's one thing that can be depended upon if the worst does happen. The Soviets have long-range bombers in considerable numbers and missiles or no missiles they still represent a constant threat for launching of a surprise attack.

Correction! They would represent a threat for surprise attack without the North American Air Defense Command warning and interception system.

The only really positive thing that can be said about air defense at the present time is that "We haven't been attacked." It has a nice ring to it. We'd like to go on saying it.

As far as the threat from manned aircraft is concerned we'll be able to go on saying it, without a questioning glance skyward, only as long as we keep up to date with our present air defense system.

There's no disputing the urgency of missile development. But let's not write

off the burglar alarm because the thief may have a magic wand which makes it unnecessary for him to break down the door.

Let's keep things in their proper perspective. We have good defense against manned aircraft. Let's keep it that way and stay current, because "we haven't been attacked — yet."

Continuing development on high performance interceptors, and Avro's CF-105 Årrow is one of the more promising of this breed, is one of the guarantees that we can go on not being attacked.

Both major political parties in Canada have on more than one occasion stressed that their policy on defense is the maintenance of strong forces, in being, as a deterrent to attack.

The physical requirements for maintaining adequate defense (the weapons our independent military experts say they need) do not alter with changes in government.

It is difficult to reconcile these facts with the hesitancy that has been evident in making defense procurement decisions in recent months and with the petty criticisms which has engaged Opposition members concerning defense arrangements which are really carry-overs from their own days on the Government side of the House.

It should be possible to get on with the defense job efficiently and with the dispatch it demands no matter which party is in power.

ograviaa

?\$

CAMADIAN AUIATION

5464