

Bomarc1956/sensEqpt.jpg

3 May Ontario.  
29 Apr 57

Air Member,  
Canadian Joint Staff,  
2450 Massachusetts Ave. N.W.,  
Washington 8, D.C. USA

BOMARC - Liaison Activities

1 Please refer to the following:

- (a) Our 81920-105-4 (AMTS), dated 12 Nov 56;
- (b) Your 825-14-2 (AFCS), dated 3 Jan 57;
- (c) Your 25-14-2 (C Staff 0), dated 25 Jan 57.

2 As indicated in reference 1(a) above, consideration of the many factors associated with activating BOMARC squadrons in the North Bay and Ottawa areas is continuing. Because these bases are essentially to accommodate the requirements of the integrated defense system of North America and because present US regulations preclude Canada from having sole custody of atomic and other sensitive equipment, a mutual USAF-RCAP effort is now favoured over the original concept of Canadian manufacture. In this latest proposal, the RCAF would supply all base facilities including shelters, launching equipment, and personnel while the USAF would supply missiles and special test equipment. In this way the bases would be assigned a priority suitable to COMAD and the USAF would be able to maintain direct custody of the sensitive equipment. It would be necessary for the RCAF to procure in the US and/or have manufactured in Canada the necessary installed and ground support equipment. Also, the USAF would be required to absorb the training of RCAF personnel.

3 The CAC has obtained the approval of the Cabinet Defence Committee to negotiate the introduction of BOMARC into the RCAF and the USAF are generally aware of and agree with the above concept. However, until our operational and planning staffs have completed the detailed requirements, decided upon the best weapons deployment, and formulated the associated programme, little detail can be discussed with the USAF. Similarly, pending the foregoing, technical effort beyond maintaining current data on the system is also being held in abeyance.

4 Because the demand for current technical information is now at a peak for planning purposes, the course of action proposed in references 1 (b) and 1 (c), above, is concurred in and should be completed as soon as possible. In the absence of a firm programme, your suggestion of a single Canadian authority or project office for handling BOMARC information and liaison is considered premature, except as now practiced unofficially within AFHQ.

5 The presently conceived limited RCAF provided equipment will decrease the number of agencies and personnel who will require direct liaison with the USAF and BOMARC contractors. Initially, this can be restricted to a very few CJS (W) and AFHQ staff members; a list of those involved at AFHQ can be provided as you have suggested at any time the present clearance procedure appears inadequate or cumbersome.