

NORAD—Canada-U.S. Agreement

contact with Colorado Springs within 40 seconds. I wonder whether this also applies to the possibility of his attending a political meeting in a little red school house somewhere in northern British Columbia—

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Regier: —or I am hoping that, like the rest of us, he will be able to take a holiday. Will the 40-second phone call rule also apply to him if he is out on the golf links somewhere? We recall also that St. Hubert is involved and our own command in Canada is concerned and would also be consulted.

I am very pleased that the Prime Minister introduced the subject of the rules of engagement as they were first issued in 1951. I think the Canadian people ought to be told, and can safely be told, that the orders have already been issued. I do not think we should try to hide that from the Canadian people. The officers commanding all branches of our armed forces have already received orders governing their action in every conceivable eventuality, and for us to pretend there is going to be wide consultation among civilian authorities in the case of an emergency is clearly a lot of eyewash intended to lull the people of Canada into a false sense of security. I would go so far as to say that all NATO area commanders have already received their orders and it is rather foolish for us to be threshing straw and attempting to define who is responsible for giving the order which would have to be given at whatever might be the crucial moment.

I particularly regret this desertion of the principle of collective security in favour of an agreement with one other nation. It completely changes the concept of collective defence. I believe that all our allies in western Europe have for some time felt uneasy at the desertion of the traditional policy of NATO. When NATO was founded we told the Soviet union that one foot on the soil of any one of us would mean instant retaliation. Now, the nations of Europe have been told this no longer applies, that they are expendable and that an invader will be allowed to swallow them up inch by inch and yard by yard.

An hon. Member: Sheer nonsense. They will be disturbed if they hear your speech.

Mr. Regier: Hon. members can shout "sheer nonsense" all they like but I know that the policy of the United States is continental defence first and western Europe defence second.

Mr. Nesbitt: How do you know that?

Mr. Regier: All their actions over the past several years have tended in that direction, and there is great concern among all the allied NATO countries in Europe. There is a feeling that this concept of limited warfare in which as much as a whole European nation could be involved has now been accepted in North America, and I do not think the people of Europe are going to feel very happy when they hear that Canada and the United States are now making arrangements of their own. They feel that we will help them along, supply them with missile bases, give them missiles, even with atomic warheads and so on, but that if the fatal day should arrive we would not necessarily abide by our NATO undertaking that an attack on the territory of any one power is to be regarded as an attack on the territory of all.

I am sure the Prime Minister is hoping for the unanimous agreement of this house with regard to the NORAD resolution. However, we would like him to explain to us how this agreement hastens the day when we will have an international police force; we would like him to explain how it strengthens NATO; we would like him to tell us what satisfaction our European allies will receive from the existence of the NORAD arrangement. We want to know where the NORAD agreement is in force, who gives the commands. What does the Prime Minister mean when he refers to new and further developments? Is he hinting at some great expansion in defence expenditure when he refers to NORAD? We are not yet clear as to where SAC planes are in the air. If they are not in Canadian skies—and we occupy more than half of the northern hemisphere—where are they? And we are not yet satisfied with regard to their carrying nuclear weapons. Yet if they are not loaded with nuclear weapons what is the purpose of having them in the air at all?

Speaking for myself I should like the Prime Minister to explain how the NORAD agreement is in line with the statement he made in Edmonton as reported by the Canadian Press, as follows:

Prime Minister Diefenbaker says leaders of the free world must have a positive and vital program in the race for men's minds instead of employing a negative and defensive policy designed to answer soviet propaganda.

I hope the Prime Minister will explain how that ideal of his, which I am sure all of us share, and which we think is most urgent and vital today is being assisted by the NORAD agreement. We feel that the NORAD agreement may well be a danger to peace and render a disservice to western Europe unless we receive satisfactory replies to the