

*NORAD—Canada—U.S. Agreement*

will not and cannot start wars. It can come into action only if potential aggressors are over our territory.

And yet in another place he says "it contains as well the powers to retaliate against aggressors".

I find it hard to reconcile those two statements. He assures us that he has met these commanders and we should have every confidence in them, that the role of NORAD is defence and not attack and its objective is defensive, not aggressive; that it can go into action only if potential aggressors are over our territory and at the same time he says it contains as well the power to retaliate against aggressors. For a defensive force to be able to retaliate requires a little more than simply powers of a defensive nature.

There has been further confusion with respect to the planes of the strategic air command. We were assured as long ago as 1957 that a large portion of the planes attached to SAC were continuously airborne in order to be ready to implement our policy of instant retaliation as our major contribution to the so-called deterrent to war, and yet we were assured by the Minister of National Defence that except in special circumstances none of these planes is in Canadian skies. For many months, in fact as much as half a year, we were assured that if they were over Canadian territory they were, except under special circumstances, not equipped with nuclear weapons, and many of us were wondering what was the purpose of having these planes in the air if they were not ready to start retaliatory action which might be needed at a moment's notice. What was the purpose of it?

However, we now have the situation where, possibly to further clarify the matter, we are assured that they are avoiding flying under ordinary conditions in their routine flights over Canadian territory, and I repeat the question put by the member for Vancouver East (Mr. Winch): Why do they want refueling bases if they are not to be found over Canadian territory?

I would like to refer for a moment to the proposal put forth some days ago when the Prime Minister, in his efforts to be political in this matter, was attempting to bait the opposition into opposing the NORAD agreement and when he made reference to continental defence. I have with me a copy of the Ogdensburg agreement which, I believe, was the first conscious effort at providing for continental defence. This was read into the record by the late prime minister, Mr. Mackenzie King, on November 12, 1940. Mr. King read as follows:

[Mr. Regier.]

The Prime Minister and the President have discussed the mutual problems of defence in relation to the safety of Canada and the United States.

It has been agreed that a permanent joint board on defence shall be set up at once by the two countries.

This permanent joint board on defence shall commence immediate studies relating to sea, land and air problems including personnel and material.

It will consider in the broad sense the defence of the north half of the western hemisphere.

The permanent joint board on defence will consist of four or five members from each country, most of them from the services. It will meet shortly.

That was an advisory committee set up to study the mutual problems of defence and to then make appropriate recommendations to their respective governments in respect of such action as might be considered necessary. That was an altogether different matter from the NORAD agreement now before us. I very much regret that we were not given the chance to take a close analytical look at this agreement, that we were not able to consider it in committee, even in a committee on external affairs meeting in camera. We have not been assured that this is going to be done.

We are rather concerned, as was so ably pointed out by the hon. member for Kootenay West, that in our opinion there seems to be—and I want to be fair—a departure from the principle of NATO. NATO was an organization formed wherein some 16 countries agreed that an attack on one was an attack on all. We now have a new arrangement whereby two countries, or possibly even one country—and I am not sure whether under the NORAD agreement this is not possible—one country alone may engage in warfare without consultation with the 14 or 15 NATO allies.

An indication was given by the Prime Minister that NORAD was not a diminution of Canadian sovereignty. We do not, however, need to fool ourselves. Every time we sign an international agreement we relinquish Canadian sovereignty. That is the sole purpose of affixing our signature to such an agreement. We have never been really disturbed or alarmed at the prospect of relinquishing Canadian sovereignty provided such sovereignty was relinquished to a world-wide organization devoted to the cause of peace, such as the United Nations, or previously to the League of Nations, or even to a group of nations having ideals very similar to our own and who have decided to band together for reasons of collective security.

Much confusion still exists as to who gives the orders. We were at one time given to understand in this house that the decision would be made at Colorado Springs. Our Minister of National Defence (Mr. Pearkes) made much of the fact that he could get into