

NORAD—Canada-U.S. Agreement

It seems to me, to summarize the situation, that NORAD reports only to Ottawa and to Washington, and that its tie with NATO is only an undertaking to keep NATO informed.

What is the actual situation? If I am right in my interpretation it seems that NORAD, through the standing military group, advises NATO only for the purposes of planning. Operationally NORAD is under direct United States and Canadian control, and only under their control. The commander in chief, General Partridge of the United States and his deputy, Air Marshal Slemon of the R.C.A.F., report to their governments jointly. General Partridge is responsible to both governments for any major decisions.

And so I come to my first question, which is this. In the absence of General Partridge—let us suppose he should be sick—does Air Marshal Slemon report to both governments, and is he responsible for any major decisions. Is this the intention of the government of Canada? The NORAD agreement places the R.C.A.F. continental defence forces under American operational command in the event of war.

I have another question. Will the United States commander of NORAD have authority to order the R.C.A.F. to shoot down planes which the commander considers hostile, without first clearing his order with the Canadian government? To my way of thinking the most important single element in NATO's defensive strength, at least until this time, undoubtedly has been the United States strategic air force. Although NATO's defence forces would be meaningless without this deterrent in the background there has been no sharing by the United States of its responsibility for or control of this key military power.

What about the question of civilian control? The Secretary of State for External Affairs says that NORAD does not deny the "primacy of civilian authority". Section 1 of the agreement states that the two governments will approve "a concept of air defence". Section 6 of the agreement states:

The plans and procedures to be followed by NORAD in wartime shall be formulated and approved in peacetime by appropriate national authorities and shall be capable of rapid implementation in an emergency.

The Secretary of State for External Affairs told parliament that the two governments had approved the detailed terms of reference, and those latter words are found in section 7 of the agreement; but he went on to say that in the interests of national security he could not disclose them. Paragraph 3, if I may call it

so, of the preamble which appears on page 1 of the copy of the agreement which I have refers to "a demand for rapid decision to keep pace with the speed and tempo of technological developments" and says that, "to achieve effectiveness, defensive operations must commence as early as possible and enemy forces must be kept constantly engaged". I suppose the idea is to stop an enemy in the far north if that be possible.

The question that comes to my mind is this. In the event of attack would there be time for consultation before countermeasures were taken? Another question is, has General Partridge been given authority to shoot first and ask permission later from Washington and Ottawa? If so, where is this shown in the agreement?

According to the remarks made by the Minister of National Defence last evening no squadrons have yet been assigned or committed to NORAD; and I ask the question, if the agreement is to have any value, why not? Is the government holding back until parliament has approved this agreement? After all, up until a week ago the government had no intention of submitting the agreement to this house for discussion. Why is this? How can NORAD be effective without our participation? What is the purpose of this agreement if we do not participate?

When General Partridge, the commander in chief of NORAD, was in Ottawa some ten days ago no opportunity was given hon. members to hear his views in a closed session. When General Montgomery, General Norstad and General Gruenther came to Ottawa this opportunity was provided. Why the mystery? Why was no opportunity given hon. members to hear the views of General Partridge?

I think it is obvious that air defence for North America must be provided by the United States air force and the Royal Canadian Air Force, and not by NATO. It is quite understandable that the United States wants to keep NORAD outside the authority of NATO in the interests of military efficiency, rapid decision and speed of implementation. The government might consider sacrifices of national sovereignty for NATO's sake because Canada believes in collective security with several other nations such as those in NATO, but the government should carefully consider the surrender of any sovereignty in a two-way partnership with the United States. There is a great difference in power between the two countries, and this might in turn react to Canada's disadvantage in arriving at a joint NORAD decision.

I would like to know how much authority the Canadian government has conceded to the