

NORAD—Canada-U.S. Agreement

saying that neither David Lewis nor Russ Bell had anything to do with the preparation of this speech. However, I will say that I got a great deal of help in preparing my remarks, and whenever that happens I always give due credit to the individual or individuals who have assisted me. I am honest enough to admit it.

We are thankful for the opportunity to participate in a debate of this nature for the purpose of attempting to understand the implications and obligations of NORAD. In the discussions that have taken place in the house and outside it prior to this motion being presented it has been evident that there was a great deal of conflict in the minds of hon. members, newspaper men and the general public. There was a general state of confusion and bewilderment as to just what NORAD meant and how it would apply. There was no genuinely concrete understanding of NORAD, and the Prime Minister (Mr. Diefenbaker), the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Pearkes) and the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Smith) have at one time or another participated in contributing to the confusion that existed prior to the motion being presented.

We hoped that when the mover of the motion introduced it there would be some elucidation with respect to NORAD. We hope that if other government speakers participate in the debate there will be further elucidation on their part as to what NORAD means. I must say, however, that I was disappointed with the Prime Minister's remarks. The understanding we have now is not much better than we had before. I hope that this situation will be cleared up later in the debate. So far we have seen the understanding of NORAD degenerate from a paradoxical perplexity to a state of deliberate and apparently organized confusion. In my opinion the Prime Minister, with all the legalistic training he has at his command, did nothing but bewilder the house by attempting to stretch the NATO agreement to justify some previous statements. I do not intend to deal with that because I think that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Pearson), even though he does not have NORAD or SAC under his command, did quite an effective job in shooting the Prime Minister down in flames so far as this matter is concerned.

I come to something now that has been prepared for me by somebody else. I must confess I could not have prepared it myself because it is too contradictory. The ghost writers here are the Prime Minister and the Minister of National Defence and evidence of their kindness towards me can be found in *Hansard* of yesterday. I should like to make reference first to what is known as

the plan of NORAD. On page 995 of *Hansard* for yesterday we find the Prime Minister had this to say:

When you look at the plan, and when you see it again in detail in this report to which I have made reference, namely, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, 1957, you realize how difficult it is to understand why there should be so much said about a matter such as this.

On the same page he went on to say:

—this agreement represents the culmination of negotiations carried on by the previous government.

The reference to culmination would indicate that this is the highest point to which these discussions led and that the agreement tabled by the Secretary of State for External Affairs is it. It can go no farther. It is all inclusive and all we have to do is look at it and we will understand completely what NORAD means. With reference to the action of the government shortly after taking office the Prime Minister went on to say, as found on page 995:

When we took office the government came to the conclusion that this integration of operational control of our air defence was important and should no longer be delayed, and authorized the establishment of the joint NORAD headquarters on a provisional basis pending the working out of some detailed minor terms of agreement between our governments.

Obviously the agreement that has been tabled represents the detailed minor terms of agreement to which the Prime Minister made reference, the implication being that there are many more things to come, and in the light of what we have heard so far from the government benches there certainly is, in our opinion, quite a bit more to come. The Minister of National Defence also made some reference to this plan at page 1028 of *Hansard* for June 10, 1958. Apparently this was in answer to a question by the Leader of the Opposition:

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Pearson) asked whether there was a master plan drawn up during the two days when General Partridge was visiting Canada. Plans for the defence of this country—complicated plans such as those which must be eventually completed—cannot be drawn up in a few hours. I explained that they were preliminary discussions leading up to a plan which is continually being evolved.

We have the Prime Minister saying there is a plan. Then, we have him saying, no, there is no plan; these are just some minor details of the agreement. The Minister of National Defence said at one stage that there were a number of plans, and then said, no, there was not. He said we are still consulting about it and eventually we hope to have some sort of a plan. I do not know whether or not there is a plan, and I am sure many hon. members on the government benches are not too sure just where we stand on this