

NORAD—Canada-U.S. Agreement

if it is negated it will disapprove the agreement. If the amendment has the effect of denying the motion it is unnecessary and irrelevant because those members who wish to disapprove the agreement have only to vote against the motion as it stands.

If the amendment adds something to the motion in a positive way it is a declaration of principle in these terms, that it is advisable for the government to give consideration to the taking of such steps as are necessary to integrate these agreements within the structure of NATO. Assuming that the amendment and the motion were accepted you would have the agreement approved but you would have added to it a declaration of this independent principle which is not related to the motion nor is it necessary for the decision of the motion in question.

That view is reinforced by a consideration of the limited number of cases where it is possible to introduce a principle by way of an amendment. There are only three or four cases. A very similar matter was considered by the Speaker in 1932 as set out on page 48 of the *Journals* of the house for October 20, 1932. If I may, I should like to read the relevant portions to indicate the limitations that all members are under in an attempt to add a principle to a motion of this kind. The Speaker of that time said:

There is no doubt in my mind that under standing order 48—

Which is now 44.

—this motion can be amended. The original motion before the house approves the trade agreement entered into at Ottawa 20th August, 1932, between representatives of the government of Canada and of the government of the United Kingdom. The amendment proposed both approves and disapproves of the agreement. It is out of order for the following reasons.

Then the Speaker deals with paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 of the proposed amendment which I do not need to cite and goes on to deal with paragraphs 4 and 5 about which he says:

Paragraphs 4 and 5 affirm general principles which cannot be moved as amendments to motions of this sort but which could be moved on other occasions.

For example, a motion clearly could be brought forward for the purposes of this amendment but it would have to be on notice and as an independent motion. I continue with the quotation:

May, Bourinot and Redlich indicate that the only motions upon which amendments declaratory of principle may be moved are motions for an address in reply to the speech from the throne, motions to go into committee of ways and means and supply and for the second reading of public bills.

Then he cites the references in these three authorities. On these grounds I must declare the amendment to be out of order.

[Mr. Speaker.]

(Translation):

Mr. Alexis Caron (Hull): Mr. Speaker, the motion now before the house reads as follows:

That it is expedient that the houses of parliament do approve an exchange of notes constituting an agreement between the government of Canada and the government of the United States of America concerning the organization and operation of the North American air defence command (NORAD) signed at Washington May 12, 1958, and that this house do approve the same.

In moving this resolution, the Prime Minister forces us to approve of principles which we have long recognized as necessary for the defence of our country and that of North America.

On the other hand, so many objections were raised by the various speakers in this debate, that we are wondering whether, in fact, it is fair to ask parliament to approve of an agreement so lacking in clarity as that which was signed on May 12 by the Canadian Ambassador, Mr. Robertson, and by the Hon. John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State for the United States.

However, this discussion will have enabled us to see a second side to the Prime Minister of Canada whom we have heard in the past invariably advocate, in grandiloquent statements, respect for the rights of parliament and rebuke the government of the day, in and out of season, for not respecting the rights of parliament and of hon. members. If he has come forward with this resolution at this time, it is not however of his own volition, but because he was forced into it by repeated demands of the opposition which required that this matter be submitted to parliamentary approval. We know also that since last October, the Liberal party and the C.C.F. had requested that the government acquaint the house with the discussions which were taking place regarding North American defence. This request was always refused on the ground that the agreement had not proceeded far enough as yet. Moreover the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Pearkes) had said: "How can this matter be brought before the house when there is nothing final or complete about it?"

Nevertheless, this year when the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Smith) spoke about the agreement he did state categorically, at least originally, that in his opinion NORAD was an integral part of NATO and that, therefore, there seemed to be no necessity to have it discussed by parliament since it was merely an extension of something which had already been accepted and existed at that time. The Leader of the Opposition, and several other opposition mem-