

NORAD—Canada-U.S. Agreement

bers, rose to insist on an opportunity being offered hon. members to discuss this agreement signed on May 12 in Washington. It was only as a result of that insistence that the Prime Minister rose to say that we were to be given the opportunity of discussing it, and that we were to have before us a resolution which would provide for a complete and useful discussion.

At the time we began to study this resolution, we already knew that there was a great deal of confusion about it. Yet, with each of our hon. friends opposite rising in an attempt to clarify the situation, it grows murkier than ever.

There is no doubt that the United States and Canada have been on friendly terms for a long time. In fact, even if at times there have been causes of friction, Canada and the United States have been living in peace side by side since 1813. This is evidence of the fact that we are old-time friends of the United States but it does not mean that we should give up our personality as a nation and that we should not be considered as an autonomous country with rights of its own.

I believe that, according to the agreement signed on May 12, we are surrendering part of our sovereignty. As the Leader of the Opposition so aptly put it, there is nothing in this that compares with the sacrifices we are making for NATO. Several countries of the world have agreed in the face of danger to sacrifice part of their sovereignty for the common good. Is this agreement between the United States and Canada identical with the NATO agreement? NATO is made up of several countries whereas in this case there are only two countries making decisions outside of NATO. Regardless of what was said by the Secretary of State for External Affairs, by the Prime Minister and by the Minister of National Defence, this agreement is quite distinct from NATO, because the Secretary General of NATO, who was in Ottawa recently, admitted that NORAD is not part of NATO, that he had not heard of it, that it had not been discussed beforehand and that it was an experiment being looked at with interest by NATO. However, there was no statement from this international authority to indicate that it is indeed part and parcel of NATO.

On the other hand, here is what I read in the introductory paragraphs of the letter sent by Mr. Robertson to Mr. John Foster Dulles:

The Canada-United States region is an integral part of the NATO area.

So far, we are all agreed; no one denies that the United States and Canada are members of NATO in so far as the defence of our common good is concerned.

In support of the strategic objectives established in NATO for the Canada-United States region and in accordance with the provisions of the North Atlantic Treaty—

Please note that there is no mention of "strategic objectives established by NORAD", nor of "strategic objectives established by the Minister of National Defence of Canada and the Secretary of State of the United States", but there is mention of the "strategic objectives established in NATO." Up to this point, NATO had not been consulted and had not been informed of what Canada and the United States were to decide...

—for the Canada-United States region and in accordance with the provisions of the North Atlantic Treaty, our two governments have, by establishing the North American Air Defence Command, recognized the desirability of integrating headquarters exercising operational control over assigned air defence forces.

Now, I do not see here any likeness, no comparison with the treaty binding the NATO nations. Besides, the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. Winch) while making his comparisons, pointed out many details proving that the agreement which we have entered into with the United States is certainly not one that falls within the framework of NATO.

I note in the preamble of the articles of the agreement the following:

In view of the foregoing considerations and on the basis of the experience gained in the operation on an interim basis of the North American air defence command, my government proposes that the following principles should govern the future organization and operations of the North American air defence command.

However, in the preamble immediately preceding the agreement which was signed, there is absolutely no reference to NATO. Yet we were given as an excuse that this agreement should not be submitted to parliament because it did form part of the NATO concept.

Well, if the right hon. Prime Minister were still in the opposition, I wonder whether his approach of the matter would have been the same. Those who have been members of this house since at least 1953 will recall the many times when the present Prime Minister rose in criticism of the former government's attitude, which, however, was very much broader than the present administration's, for no statement, no international agreement was ever made or signed without being first submitted to this house.

We are now before an accomplished fact. The fact is that we have signed an agree-