

## NORAD—Canada-U.S. Agreement

under NATO, and I am referring to page 13, including even the Canadian-United States regional planning group. Article 3 states as follows:

In order more effectively to achieve the objectives of this treaty, the parties, separately and jointly, by means of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid, will maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack.

There is nothing there about SACLANT or committees or SACEUR or anything else, and indeed the note which has been presented to the house is much more specific and sets out much more detail than the proposals outlined in the North Atlantic treaty.

I would like to conclude by reminding the house that having regard to the organic nature of the Canadian-United States regional planning group and, with the same personnel as the joint chiefs of staff to whom the commander in chief of NORAD is responsible, I believe we can say that this is an amplification and an extension of NATO. I would like to express the hope that we will have a unanimous endorsement of this proposal by this house. The proposal embodied in the note provides for the effective defence of Canada under a single command which, it has been demonstrated to us by our military advisers, is much more effective as a means to meet the needs of the day and the possible dangers with which we may be faced where immediate action within minutes or even seconds, is of the utmost importance. The proposal also provides for the more effective co-ordination of the two air forces than had been possible up to August 1, 1957. I would also remind the house that the military authority under this proposal is subject to civilian control and that NORAD is part of the defences of which we find the apex in the strategic force and, in NATO, the defence of the west against possible nuclear war.

**Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East):** And that, Mr. Speaker, is the speech of the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Smith), on perhaps one of the most important issues ever to come before this House of Commons. Here we have a treaty between Canada and the United States—a solitary foreign power—dealing fundamentally with the defence of Canada in the event of aggression and the placement of a major part of our armed forces under the ultimate control of that foreign power. And that is the speech of the Secretary of State for External Affairs on this subject. It is almost inconceivable that that is all the Secretary of State for External Affairs has to tell this House of Commons.

Priority was given to trying to explain away a very definite statement made by Mr.

Spaak. It was not quite fair in my estimation, at least, for the hon. gentleman, perhaps not intentionally, to cast a slur upon hon. members who may have quoted that esteemed authority. It is only correct that they should have quoted him, because, after all, he is the secretary general of NATO and perhaps the highest authority who could be quoted in the circumstances with respect to a treaty which, the government maintains, is an integral part of NATO itself.

I was most interested to read back on May 20 in various newspapers across the country a statement by a Canadian Press staff writer to the effect that the Canada-United States agreement on the air defence of North America must rank as one of the fuzziest international documents of recent times. That certainly was my impression at the time, and I know that everyone in this chamber had a heartfelt hope that when this matter finally came up for discussion the fuzziness would be cleared away and that a plain explanation would be given with regard to this treaty and the principles of its application.

Mr. Speaker, one can only speak for oneself, but I wish to state that in my estimation the entire situation still seems to be in a welter of confusion and contradiction; even the statements made by hon. members on the government side during this debate have done nothing to clear up the discrepancies. I cannot reconcile the statements made in the past by the Prime Minister (Mr. Diefenbaker) and by the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Pearkes). They have not yet been explained. Government speakers have been endeavouring to argue—or make it clear as far as they can, I suppose—that NORAD is an emanation of NATO and that political approval of NORAD therefore flows directly from approval of NATO. The Prime Minister had this to say on December 21, as reported page 2721 of *Hansard*:

I want to re-emphasize what I pointed out there, and it was accepted as a fact, that these integrated forces are an integral part of the NATO military structure in the Canada-United States region.

It was not so many days after the Prime Minister made that statement that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Pearson), on January 4, asked a question of the Minister of National Defence which is to be found on page 2865 of *Hansard* of that date. He asked a question as follows:

Is it the intention of the government, when agreement has been reached with the United States on the political arrangements covering the defence organization, to submit that political agreement to the NATO council for discussion with the NATO partners in the hope, perhaps, that an agreement of this kind can be made an integral part of the NATO organization?