

NORAD—Canada-U.S. Agreement

To that question the Minister of National Defence made the reply to be found on page 2866 of *Hansard*, and he said:

That matter would, of course, have to be discussed with the United States. I cannot make any firm commitment. I can only express a personal opinion which it would not be wise for me to express here. It would have to be discussed, as the hon. gentleman knows, with the United States.

So, Mr. Speaker, here we have the Prime Minister stating that NORAD was an integral part of NATO, and then we have the Minister of National Defence saying he could not say whether it was or not without discussing it with the United States. That contradiction has not yet been cleared up, either yesterday or today. As a matter of fact, the only definite statement we have on the subject whatsoever—and I say this though it may hurt the feelings of the Secretary of State for External Affairs—is the clear-cut statement made by Mr. Spaak as quoted verbatim by the Leader of the Opposition last evening.

Now, let us turn directly to the formal notes with which we are actually dealing. What does this document say?

It says this:

In view of the foregoing considerations and on the basis of the experience gained in the operation on an interim basis of the North American air defence command, my government proposes that the following principles should govern the future organization and operation of the North American air defence command.

(1) The commander-in-chief NORAD will be responsible to the chiefs of staff committee of Canada and the joint chiefs of staff of the United States, who in turn are responsible to their respective governments.

Where is NATO there? NATO is just not there at all. The formal note continues and says, in paragraph 2:

The North American air defence command will include such combat units and individuals as are specifically allocated to it by the two governments.

Let us review that very briefly: "In view of the foregoing considerations and on the basis of the experience gained in the operation of the North American air defence command" I would have thought that the Minister of National Defence or, at least, the Prime Minister, would have told us just what experience was gained in the operation on an interim basis of the North American air defence command, because we were told last night at about a quarter to ten by the Minister of National Defence that no Canadian squadrons have yet been allocated to NORAD, and I have yet to read anywhere that the United States has allocated any to NORAD either. It would be interesting to know that too. But on the basis of what we do know with regard to our own country, namely that no squadrons have been allocated to NORAD, just what is the experience that has

[Mr. Winch.]

been gained in the operation which has convinced the government that there should now be this Canada-United States agreement as has been outlined and as is now before us for consideration?

I say, "for consideration" and not for ratification because there is already a signed treaty in existence between the two governments. This brings to mind another point which I think is worthy of the utmost consideration, and that is that a treaty between Canada and the United States of this nature is most certainly a matter of external relations and is, surely, just the type of subject which we have established a standing committee on external affairs to consider. I am amazed that on a foreign relations question of this importance and nature action of this sort should not have been taken. As I have said, on the basis of the exchange as outlined in the formal notes I can find nothing which would constitute NORAD as an integral part of NATO.

I was interested when the Secretary of State for External Affairs just a few moments ago stood in his place holding in his hand a little blue booklet called "North Atlantic Treaty Organization". I presume it is exactly the same one I have, published in Paris in 1957 by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization under the authority of the information division. The Secretary of State for External Affairs referred to one page of that booklet and said that there was to be found conclusive evidence of our tie-in with NATO. It does not do any such thing.

Mr. Smith (Hastings-Frontenac): I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I never used that document for that purpose.

Mr. Winch: It certainly sounded that way. Far be it from me to question what the minister intended to convey. I would like to draw to the attention of hon. members of this house and particularly the Secretary of State for External Affairs just what is the meaning and position of NATO and for that purpose I am going to quote from page 5 of this booklet under a section headed, "Why the Treaty was Signed". It states:

The North Atlantic Treaty, signed in Washington on 4 April, 1949, arose from a community of interest long visible in the history of the west, but never before given such clear recognition and expression in time of peace. Today, the North Atlantic no longer represents a vast barrier separating two continents, but the inland sea of a closely-linked community. Its seaways and adjoining waters serve a group of nations which have been nurtured in common traditions and which share a common respect for the rule of law, and individual liberty . . .

Now, for the first time, they pooled their resources for collective defence before aggression started, in the hope and conviction that in this way they would preserve peace.