

## NORAD—Canada-U.S. Agreement

reference which are mentioned in the note must be prepared with the concurrence of the governments. Also with respect to the plans or procedures—and those are strictly military, I am informed; I have not seen them—they must be acceptable to the national authorities.

The question with respect to sovereignty was raised this afternoon. I put the matter this way, Mr. Speaker. It is very simple. If I enter into a contract with, let us say, the hon. member for Essex East (Mr. Martin), in so far as I restrict or limit my course of action to any particular degree, I am bound. If that is said to be loss of personal freedom, I would dispute that contention. I go to other treaties; I mention other treaties. I mention entering into a treaty involving abrogation or even surrender of sovereignty. I go to the North Atlantic Treaty which was approved, as we have been told on several occasions, in this house. I might be able to accept the proposition that there has perhaps been a temporary delegation of sovereignty. If that could be validated, then I would say it is undoubtedly justified, having regard to the military danger in which we find ourselves.

In his speech last night reference was made by the Leader of the Opposition to the question of consultation. He remarked that he was very happy to note that continuous consultation should take place. This was emphasized in the note between Canada and the United States. Over the years there has been set up machinery and procedures for consultation. The Leader of the Opposition would well know of the accuracy of that particular observation on my part. I agree with what has been said here that the establishment of NATO makes political consultation between the two countries much more necessary. And that is why we were happy in our negotiations with the state department to find that they were eager—not only willing, but eager—to emphasize this point and this is evidence of continued and full co-operation. The emphasis is to be found in these words contained in the note as follows:

The two governments consider that the establishment of integrated air defence arrangements of the nature described increases the importance of the fullest possible consultation between the two governments on all matters affecting the joint defence of North America, and that defence co-operation between them can be worked out on a mutually satisfactory basis only if such consultation is regularly and consistently undertaken.

I would say, however, that we do not propose to set up new machinery merely for the sake of doing so, but that if we find our present machinery—and I think now of the joint defence board and other organizations

[Mr. Smith (Hastings-Frontenac).]

in addition to our normal diplomatic communications—is not sufficient to provide the proper machinery for consultation, then we will endeavour to improve what we have or will even look at the possibility of making changes.

Let me assure the house, as I did on May 19 last, that in both Ottawa and Washington there exists determination to ensure that such consultation will be carried out and that the procedures and methods of integration between our two countries, not only in respect of NORAD but also in respect of other facets of continental military defence, will be fully and frankly discussed.

This afternoon a question was raised with respect to the powers and responsibilities of the deputy commander in chief of NORAD. I have consulted with my colleague, the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Pearkes), and he confirms the information I am about to give. I do think, incidentally, that this information is quite clear in the note; in the absence of the commander in chief the deputy commander will assume his powers and his responsibilities. It is stated very clearly in the note that in the absence of the commander in chief, NORAD, command passes to the deputy commander, and there are no reservations in this very positive and categorical statement.

As the Minister of National Defence indicated last night, the commander in chief, NORAD, has been away on many occasions and the minister stated today that the deputy commander, Air Vice Marshal Slemon, has been recognized by his colleagues as full commander on such occasions. The hon. member for Essex East (Mr. Martin) last evening indicated that in his view NORAD really is not an agreement at all, and I would like to quote briefly from page 1027 of *Hansard* for June 10, as follows:

The agreement is not an elaborate one; in fact it is not an agreement at all. The material before us does not represent an agreement, it represents an agreement to agree on something. It is no more than that.

In reply to that, I would say to this house that all one has to do is to read carefully the articles to be found on pages 3 and 4 of the note. I am not going to examine the details at this moment and thereby take up the time of the house but I would just mention that in articles 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 we find the word “will” and we find the word “must”, which is even stronger when used in that context.

I was very interested in the remarks of the hon. member for Essex East last evening and at that time I had on my desk a copy of the North Atlantic treaty. Here is the article which provides for the machinery for defence