

NORAD—Canada-U.S. Agreement

production programs. This also causes us some misgivings and concern.

We feel, therefore, that parliament is confronted with the fact that integration of defence with the United States involves not only loss of control over certain Canadian defence units but may also mean an even closer interdependence, from an economic point of view, with that nation. It is precisely because of the seemingly inevitable tie-up with the United States at the economic level that it is all the more important to avoid putting ourselves in a politically subordinate position to the United States. Whereas we may not be able to avoid becoming more and more economically dependent on the United States if we are to meet our air defence requirements, we can avoid making bilateral political concessions.

It would seem imperative from the point of view of preventing the loss of our political sovereignty to a single power, or any part of that sovereignty, that ways and means be explored to make those carrying out North American defence arrangements directly responsible and subordinate to the NATO command. This point of view has been ably stated by *Le Devoir* in an editorial which was reprinted in the *Ottawa Journal* on May 26, 1958, as follows:

Canada, as a member of NATO, shares in the defence of western Europe. Would it not be wiser and more logical to place the defence of our tremendous territory in the north in the framework of the Atlantic pact? The protection of our Arctic region is important not only for the United States but for the whole Atlantic coalition.

To instal radar posts in the north, we have negotiated directly and only with the U.S. The DEW line is already out of date, for its equipment cannot disclose ballistic projectiles travelling at high altitude. Probably therefore this network will have to be amplified and improved which will accentuate the intervention and authority of Washington on Canadian soil.

For our air defence, we have negotiated an agreement which is already in force, it seems, and in this system installed at Colorado Springs there is an American commander who has authority over the air forces of the two countries. Are we in the same way going to negotiate directly with Washington a bilateral pact for bases of nuclear projectiles?

We ask the same question in this group. We want to know where we are going in this respect. Supersonic jet bombers and inter-continental ballistic missiles have made the Canadian north a key area in the event of war with the Soviet union, perhaps just as important strategically as any area in Europe. An attack over the Canadian north would involve western Europe in the same way as an attack in western Europe would involve Canada. It would therefore seem logical that the defence of the Canadian north should be brought within the framework of NATO

in the same manner as is the defence of western Europe. In our opinion, for Canada to negotiate defence through bilateral arrangements and, in the process, risk the loss of certain sovereign rights over its forces to a single power seems a retrogressive step. As I mentioned previously, we fear that this might be an ominous forewarning, a portent of still more of such arrangements to come, which will further impair the sovereign rights of this country in relation to the United States.

Furthermore, such a step is entirely unnecessary in view of the fact that this country is already a member of a multilateral organization whose objective is the defence of all member countries. We should hope, indeed, that even the multilateral organization of NATO is but a transitional step to the ultimate attainment of a truly effective universal police force under the United Nations.

A lead in that direction was given, by the former secretary of state for external affairs. It is the firm belief of this party that the security of any nation can be maintained only through the gradual surrender of some of every nation's sovereignty in the world today, and not through what Mr. Spaak called, I believe, an interesting experiment.

Because we have such serious reservations about these proposals, we believe that members of parliament should be given an opportunity to study them with greater thoroughness. We therefore request that this matter be referred to the committee on external affairs of this house and, furthermore, that members who serve on that committee should be given access to all the information necessary for them to make a sound judgment. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Fisher):

That the said resolution be referred to the standing committee on external affairs.

There may be some question as to our motion being in order, but this house is master of its own procedures and it can, by unanimous agreement, waive the application of its usual rules. I urge the Prime Minister to give consideration to the suggestion I have made and, if the motion is not in order, to consider a suspension of the rules in order to meet this proposal made by members of this group who are seeking information on this very important matter.

As I said when I began to speak, this is a brief analysis of the situation from our point of view as a result of our gathering information from every corner and after discussions between ourselves. Other hon. members of this group will no doubt deal with the remarks