

## NORAD—Canada-U.S. Agreement

interceptors for a long time to come. They are, of course, carrying out work on research and actually have in operation certain missiles which would be available in a battle for the protection of the North American continent. Canada is also carrying out investigations and is training men in the use of missiles, which perhaps in the not too distant future may be required to supplement the defence of our country.

The hon. member for Essex East next asked if it were not true that the service chiefs could pull units out of NORAD when they saw fit. Again the answer is in the negative. As will be seen in the note it says that North American air defence command will include certain combat units and individuals as are specifically allocated by the two governments. No service chief can withdraw a unit which has been definitely allocated to a certain command by a government.

The next question was whether Canada will continue to contribute its air division to NATO forces in Europe. Of course we are going to continue to have those forces in Europe, and no doubt the house will recall that when the president of the West German republic was here recently the Prime Minister gave an emphatic promise that as long as Canadian forces were required in Europe they would remain there. At page 772 of *Hansard* for June 2, 1958, the Prime Minister used the following words:

I wish to make it clear that whatever threats may be made against those nations which believe in the mission of NATO and the necessity for its continuance, Canada will maintain forces in Europe as long as international disquiet and justifiable fears require Canadian participation.

I merely quote that as the most recent statement on this subject, and I am sure the hon. member did not really believe it was likely that the Canadian government would withdraw those troops just because we were making an even greater effort to provide for the security of this continent.

**Mr. Martin (Essex East):** Withdraw or reduce.

**Mr. Pearkes:** Withdraw or reduce.

The next point with which I would like to deal is the question of timing. Suggestions have been made in this house that we should not have acted as we did last summer with respect to this headquarters, be it of a temporary or a permanent nature; and I always understood that it would be of a temporary nature until the formal notes had established it. I did not emphasize that position at the time; perhaps I should have done, but I took it for granted that it would be considered as a temporary appointment until such time as it was confirmed in the formal note.

The question was, should we have acted then or should we have waited until the formal note had been agreed to by both governments and had been discussed here in parliament? We did gain ten months because, as experience has shown, the formal note was only recently received and has been discussed in parliament yesterday and today at really the first opportunity which has been available during this session. The note was not ready during the last session of parliament. It may be said that it should have been done more quickly, but it was not done more quickly and I do not know how it could have been done more quickly.

Should we have waited? I would like to ask hon. members to consider the situation as it was last summer. Russia had refused to accept the resolution on disarmament or the limitation of arms which had been endorsed by a very large number of the western nations. Russia had walked out of the disarmament conference, and at that time had just launched its first earth satellite. There was a good deal of concern, not only on this continent but in Europe, and there was a speeding up of defensive arrangements.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. I am sorry to have to inform the minister his time has expired.

**Some hon. Members:** Continue.

**Mr. Speaker:** Does the house give unanimous consent that the hon. minister may proceed?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Pearkes:** I shall finish in just a sentence or so, Mr. Speaker. At that time there was great concern, and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom came out to discuss the international situation with the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Canada. I submit that it was only prudent for this government to press on as quickly as possible, have the two commanders concerned get together, set up their staffs and bring up to date a plan for the defence of this continent. It is my opinion that it would have been unwise to have delayed longer and to have waited, in the circumstances which existed in the world a year ago, until several months later when the formal notes might have been presented.

**Mr. Martin (Essex East):** I think the hon. gentleman will agree there was no suggestion of that.

**Mr. Pearkes:** Certainly it was my understanding that the suggestion has been that we should not have moved as quickly as we did.

**Mr. Martin (Essex East):** No one suggested that.