

NORAD—Canada-U.S. Agreement

United States commander of NORAD. Speaking in the House of Commons on May 19 the Secretary of State for External Affairs said that the interests of national security prevented him revealing the terms of reference for General Partridge on which Ottawa and Washington had agreed. It might be better if these terms of reference were made public. I do not imagine they would startle the mentality of any enemy general considering what we may say in this debate, and it might be a good thing for Canadians to know where we stand in the whole picture of NORAD.

The question of sovereignty is important because it touches on our feelings as a developing nation. We have not had full sovereignty for so long that we can afford to give it away in bits and pieces. While the military realities are such that we depend on the United States, this should not obscure the fact that the forms of sovereignty need to be observed if we care to respect our own feelings of nationhood. We have new air problems with the United States, and it is important for us to again assert our sovereignty over the air, the water and the Arctic. In my opinion the Prime Minister should clarify that NORAD is a defensive and not an offensive mechanism.

Another important question I wish to ask is this. Can an armed United States bomber fly in Canadian air space on the way to the Soviet frontier without our specific consent? If the answer is yes then there must be an agreement with the United States, because NORAD does not cover this eventuality.

Basically speaking, political sovereignty today almost appears to be what the great powers tolerate. It is one thing to be part of a group of nations for the purpose of collective security and defence, and indeed we are happy to be part of NATO; but it is quite a different thing to enter into a bilateral agreement with our neighbour to the south in which we are only a junior partner. Although the United States is bound as the strong force to direct operations, the facts remain that Canada occupies the northern part of the North American continent, that Canada is now sandwiched in between two great powers, Russia and the United States, and that there is a possibility of our country becoming a second Belgium. Being in possession of our sovereignty we are the people with the say-so about our own territory. The United States would not tolerate any invasion of their sovereignty by us, and I think it is important that Washington remember that on the northern part of this continent it is a matter of Canadian sovereignty.

Actually it is extremely important for us to examine and demand the reasons for this

[Mr. Macnaughton.]

joint NORAD policy. If I may say so, it would be very good for the people of the United States, too. We should see to it that the plans of both countries are reasonable. We have a contribution to make in that respect. Ultimately the larger burden of defence is on the United States, but we as Canadians have the right to expect that our views will be listened to concerning the risks the United States runs in the name of defence, for those risks may become our liabilities.

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, in rising to participate in this debate I should like first of all to make a comment or two on an interjection made yesterday by the hon. member for Rosedale (Mr. Walker) as shown on page 1022 of *Hansard*. In order to be correct I will read what he said in commenting upon the remarks of the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Herridge). He used these words:

—I do not mind his reading his speech, but when he reads a speech by the C.C.F. ghost writer, David Lewis, that is another question. And I see it is going to come in instalments. The other speakers are going to give David Lewis part two—

At that point apparently he was interrupted by the hon. member for Kootenay West.

An hon. Member: He meant Russ Bell.

Mr. Howard: I am not sure what he meant but that is what he said. If hon. members on the other side say things they do not mean, it is far beyond my ability to deal with them. Whether he meant Russ Bell or David Lewis is immaterial. Contrary to what he may be accustomed to in the Conservative party, we in the C.C.F. do not employ other people to write our speeches. He may consider that the reading of written speeches is a communicable disease but those of us over here have been inoculated with a vaccine of intelligence and hard work. Consequently every C.C.F. member who rises to speak in the house presents his own arguments as prepared by himself. We not only prepare our own speeches but we do not act like we are reading the script of a radio opera when we present them to the house. When we make our speeches we deliver them as well as we possibly can without sticking too closely to notes. I thought for a minute you were going to interrupt, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Rea): I was going to interrupt the hon. member and say that we are not discussing the method of giving speeches but the motion that is before the house.

Mr. Howard: I appreciate that, Mr. Speaker, and I thank you for your remarks but inasmuch as what I said was related to the debate I thought I would prepare the way by