

NORAD—Canada-U.S. Agreement

May I interject at this point to explain what the words "pooled their resources for collective defence" mean to this group. Hon. members of this party over the years have emphasized the need for collective security and collective defence and at all times supported measures calling for these things but when we use the word "collective" that is exactly what we mean, the pooling in one collective security organization and not individual nations entering into collective security agreements when they choose and remaining outside when they wish to do so. We believe in true collective security. I continue quoting from page 5:

The treaty could not have come into existence without a major change in the policies of some of its signatories, and yet it was signed by 12 widely spread nations, varying in size and importance from the United States to Luxembourg and representing two continents. North America was represented by the United States and Canada.

In what way do the United States and Canada tie in? We can find that too, because on page 21 we read:

The council then proceeded to establish a defence committee, composed ordinarily of defence ministers, and charged with the task of drawing up unified defence plans for the north Atlantic area. It suggested specifically that the military part of the organization should include a military committee and certain regional planning groups.

May I emphasize the following comment:

The regional planning groups were instructed 'to develop and recommend to the military committee, through the standing group, plans for the defence of the region'.

In that same paragraph of the booklet Canada and the United States are indicated as one region and as such they were instructed to develop and recommend to the military committee through the standing group plans for the defence of the region. On page 47 of the report under the heading "Canada-United States Regional Planning Group" we read:

This planning group, which covers the North American area, develops and recommends to the military committee, through the standing group, plans for the defence of the Canada-United States region.

Throughout this entire official document of NATO it is understood that Canada and the United States as a regional planning group are to develop and recommend to the military committee of NATO the over-all defence plans and according to my interpretation NATO exercises supreme authority.

On the last page of this booklet there appears a graph which shows the chain of command from the supreme allied commander Atlantic right down through to our own air force and navy on the Atlantic coast. It is a graph very much different from the one supplied to the hon. members of the estimates committee yesterday by the Minister of National Defence.

As I said, we in this group have always supported to the fullest extent the concept of collective security and collective defence but we are still in the dark as to the direct relationship in conformity with NATO that exists as a result of the introduction of the NORAD treaty agreement with the United States. We strongly feel we have not been given the information which as members of the House of Commons we are entitled to receive which would give us a satisfactory understanding of the situation. There is still too much confusion and contradiction. I have already mentioned one example of the squadron control.

I suppose we cannot challenge the statement of the Minister of National Defence to the effect that the strategic air command planes of the United States air force do not fly over or from Canada and yet on the same day that statement was made the Prime Minister announced that permission had now been granted for the establishment of tanker refuelling stations in Canada. There may be a logical explanation but we have not heard it yet as to why the United States should want to establish tanker refuelling stations in Canada if United States planes are not flying over or from Canada.

There are many questions which have not been satisfactorily answered. Several contradictions have not been reconciled. The confusion has not been cleared away. I do not think hon. members of this house should be expected to reach a decision on this matter until such time as the confusion has been eliminated and the conflicting statements of ministers of the present government have been reconciled and until we have been taken into the confidence of the government as completely as possible within security provisions to enable us to appreciate the necessity for this action and be convinced that this is a direct part of the NATO command.

Mr. Speaker: May I take this opportunity to deal with the amendment which was moved by the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard) and seconded by the hon. member for Timmins (Mr. Martin) while the Acting Speaker (Mr. Rea) was in the chair. The Acting Speaker expressed the view that the amendment was probably irrelevant but reserved decision. I concur in the view he tentatively expressed as to the irrelevance of the proposed motion which I think is apparent from a consideration of the motion itself which calls for two things; first, that it is expedient that the houses of parliament do approve the agreement and, second, that this house do approve the agreement. That is all that the motion puts forward. In effect, if the motion is affirmed it will approve the agreement and