

## NORAD—Canada-U.S. Agreement

they have not received positive instructions to proceed they turn back. This is called the "fail safe" system. It was flights of this sort that led Soviet Russia to make its protest to the United Nations.

This was the article that appeared in this magazine after an interview with General Power and, as members of the house know, a United Press dispatch of April 7 from the strategic air command base in Nebraska, an article which must have been authorized by that command under that dateline, also gave some pretty alarming information even if it is wrong, and I hope it is, which resulted, of course, in this whole matter being brought before the United Nations security council. The article talked about radar under NORAD picking up unidentified objects and thereby giving information which results in planes being sent into the air headed toward the target for retaliation and, according to this report, this has taken place not once, not twice, but many times. So I hope a spokesman for the government will take advantage of this opportunity to deny in effect that this happens in so far as the use of Canadian bases is concerned and in so far as Canadian air space is concerned, and will confirm in a way which will get the maximum of publicity that the arrangements already stated by the government, and which require the consent of the Canadian government for each flight across the border of bombers carrying atomic weapons, are still in effect.

I hope also, because I think this has a bad effect on NORAD, that stories that have been appearing recently that NORAD is not operating effectively will be denied, perhaps by one of the members of the government. A story appeared in a United States and Canadian weekly with a very wide circulation, indeed it is *Time* magazine, based on an Associated Press dispatch from Colorado Springs of May 19 which said that NORAD, instead of being a model of interservice cooperation within the United States services had become a classic example of interservice rivalry and quotes a NORAD officer as calling it a monstrosity.

I would hope perhaps that story could also be denied. It might be useful to try to counteract the impression stories like that are creating in respect of functioning and operation of this joint air command, which is now just as much a Canadian command as it is a United States command.

I think the importance of this agreement has been abundantly shown. I think the justification for this discussion has already been made abundantly clear. We certainly know now, after the speech of the Prime Minister, that NORAD's responsibilities are very great and very far-reaching. We hope that later in this discussion the questions

that have been asked and will be asked from this side will be answered by representatives of the government as completely as security considerations will permit. Nobody asks the government to go beyond that. We hope, finally, that NORAD's activities in the future will inspire more confidence than the method adopted by the government to bring it into existence.

**Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West):** Mr. Speaker, first of all I must mention that I am sure we all regret that the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Argue) had to leave unexpectedly and hurriedly last night because of the serious illness of his wife in Regina. He is not able, for that reason, to be present during this most interesting and important debate.

I listened, like other members of this group, with a great deal of interest to the Prime Minister (Mr. Diefenbaker) and, I should say, very carefully indeed. From our point of view he raised some very interesting questions that will have to be answered satisfactorily when we give final consideration to this agreement. We also listened very carefully to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Pearson), and what we thought was his very clear exposition of the difficulties that are involved in this agreement and the obvious dangers involved in this arrangement unless this type of defence is undertaken through the proper procedure.

Now, what I have to say this evening is the result of the very serious concern of this group over this very important problem. It is the result of information received in the house, considerable research, reading, and also frequent consultations and discussions between the members of this group as well as the result, to some extent, of reflections on my part in solitude on this very serious question. Before I proceed further, I might say that owing to the number of references I will make and the quotations, as well as the nature and importance of the topic, I shall stick closer to my notes than is usual. My remarks will represent an analysis of the situation from the point of view of this group. I shall be followed by other speakers who will deal with various statements made by the Prime Minister and by the Leader of the Opposition, and those to come later from the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Pearkes). Finally, one member of our group, towards the conclusion of this debate, will make a summary of this group's opinion.

What I am going to aim to do tonight on behalf of the group for whom I am speaking this evening is to give an honest appraisal and analysis of the situation from our point of view. I wish the hon. member opposite