

NORAD—Canada-U.S. Agreement

by the kind of fears that he and those associated with him endeavoured to plant in their hearts.

As my hon. friend continued his course of seeking to plant doubt and confusion during the campaign he finally brought forth the most amazing thought of all when he contended in so far as trade with the United States is concerned that we must naturally protect our interests without their being prejudiced by United States policy; that we must, for instance, make it quite clear that the United States cannot expect the full and complete co-operation in continental defence which is desirable if she treats us unfairly in her tariff and trade policies.

Mr. Speaker, I spoke with restraint when I introduced this matter but now I am tempted to speak more strongly. One would never have expected that my hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition would suggest that we should attempt to use Canadian trade as a weapon in respect of continental defence by saying to the United States, in effect, that it will be without a partner in the preservation and assurance of our joint defence unless that country does what Canada wants it to do.

All during the campaign the Leader of the Opposition attempted to arouse doubt, fear and uncertainty in the minds of Canadians with respect to air defence. I have many clippings here. One article appeared in the *Ottawa Journal* on February 22, 1958, under the heading, "Raps Lack of Pact with United States". Reporting on a speech made by that hon. gentleman in London, Ontario, the article states in part:

He concentrated his main evening attack on the government's handling of the North American air defence setup, a move undertaken, he said, without any firm agreement between the two countries and without the prior consent of parliament.

He didn't criticize the fact that the Canadian-American air defence had been integrated—it was the only way to defend the continent against attack—but attacked the action of the government to agree to the setup without a pact.

In an article in the *Toronto Star* of March 21, 1958, under the heading, "United States Missile Bases Soon Not Needed in Canada" the Leader of the Opposition is reported as having said at Blind River:

Liberal leader Lester Pearson gave qualified approval last night to the idea of U.S. bases in Canada for intercontinental ballistic missiles. But he made it clear he did not favour such bases until more attempts had been made to reach an agreement with Russia and had failed.

The *Windsor Star* of February 15, 1958, reports the hon. gentleman as having said in Toronto:

—the Progressive Conservative government has given the United States "far-reaching control" over Canada's air force without first completing a political agreement to restrict the measure of that control.

He went on to speak of the dangers to the Canadian people. The hon. gentleman went across the nation with the same arguments that he used last evening.

Mr. Pearson: Why do you not answer them?

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker I know my answer to that type of attitude and I know my hon. friend will agree with me because he has said it on a number of occasions. It is necessary to realize in the world in which we live that action has to be taken defensively. I believe in the necessity for a positive and imaginative policy such as the hon. gentleman spoke of a moment ago in his concluding remarks but while advancing that policy we must above everything else maintain our defences. That particularly applies to us in North America because we are perhaps more vulnerable than any other portion of the world at this time.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I am sorry to interrupt the Prime Minister (Mr. Diefenbaker) but it is now six o'clock.

Some hon. Members: Continue.

Mr. Speaker: Does the Prime Minister have the unanimous consent of the house to continue?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I do not think I can answer these arguments in five minutes because I wish to go into some detail. I have waited here today to take part in this debate and I do not intend criticism in saying that but in order to cover this matter fully, having regard to the haze that has been cast over this subject by the opposition, which haze was first created as a smokescreen during the recent campaign, I think it would be desirable for me to take some time in order to complete my arguments.

On motion of Mr. Diefenbaker the debate was adjourned.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Chevrier: May I ask what the business is for tomorrow? I take it it is private members' day but would the leader tell us what the government intends to do on Friday?

Mr. Green: Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is private members' day. On Friday we shall conclude this debate and then go on with the estimates of the Department of Public Works.

At six o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.