

NORAD—Canada-U.S. Agreement

in that sense to attempt to assimilate their positions with those of the commanders of NATO commands is wrong and that attempt, of course, must break down.

As a matter of fact I wish this North American air defence command were under a NATO command, and I suggest to the government that perhaps this is something which might be investigated at a meeting of the North Atlantic council. It is certainly not now under a NATO command. General Partridge has no responsibility to NATO of any kind, and he has indicated that this is the position in some of the public statements he has made. He takes no orders from NATO as the NATO commanders take orders; he does not necessarily accept the policy laid down by NATO or by SACEUR and SAC-LANT and if there is any doubt at all on this matter that doubt must have been removed by a witness of unimpeachable information and objectivity, the secretary general of NATO himself.

I would like to quote, not from the press statement, because the Prime Minister has already intimated that the press report must have misinterpreted what Mr. Spaak said at his press conference, but from the verbatim record taken by tape recorder at this press conference, a record which I might say I did not get from any Canadian source but from Mr. Spaak's office. The questions as taken down on the tape recorder were as follows:

Q. Mr. Spaak, you said just now that NATO was looking with interest at NORAD. Do you consider NORAD part of NATO?

A. No, it is not under the command of NATO.

Q. Do you think of it as an extension of NATO?

A. Well, we are very interested in it but NORAD is not under the command of NATO. I think it is a very good experiment.

That is the verdict of the secretary general of NATO on the relationship between NORAD and NATO and surely there should be no further effort made by anyone to attempt to confuse that relationship by endeavouring to establish a stronger connection between the two bodies than in fact exists.

That is the background; now what about the agreement itself which we are asked to approve? Like other hon. members I have had the opportunity and the time to study this agreement and I repeat what I said a few minutes ago, that having read it over and having regard to its vague character and its generalities it is really as it has been described, merely an agreement to agree to do something. It is not easy to make any analysis of it. I find it very difficult to understand why it should have taken two governments so long to agree on this agreement which was made public after March 31, 1958.

As I understand it, in this agreement—and these are perhaps questions which my hon.

friends opposite may clear up during the course of the debate, and I hope they will because I am going to venture to ask some questions on this agreement in the hope of obtaining such clarification—there is no answer to the question how and under what circumstances the authority of NORAD is to be exercised. The exact function of the headquarters and its relationship to the two governments is not clarified. Though I certainly have no wish to be dogmatic because this is a very important matter and I have not had a chance to examine the Prime Minister's words with the care they deserve. I am not at all sure that the Prime Minister's statement this afternoon gave that kind of clarification. Certainly I do not find it in the agreement itself and, after all, the agreement is the document which is binding between the governments.

The commander of NORAD, General Partridge—and his words have been quoted before—said last summer, "The President has given his approval to use, without reference to anyone, any weapon at our disposal if there is a hostile aircraft in the sky." As I read it, this agreement indicates that that is his position with the qualification contained in the words "without reference to anyone", because surely under this agreement he must get his authority from the two governments. Certainly if that is the statement of the present position, if that is the situation under which General Partridge is operating, then it does not correspond with previous declarations by government spokesmen which have already been placed on record. They have been put on record and they serve to show the confusion and contradiction which has been developing with respect to this matter. They certainly are one of the reasons for the kind of discussion which has become necessary today.

On November 7, 1957, as reported on page 850 of *Hansard* the Minister of National Defence said in this house, "I must emphasize the fact that General Partridge does not in any sense command any Canadian armed force" I find it very difficult to reconcile his statement with the terms of this agreement because the commander of NORAD certainly does exercise control over Canadian squadrons which have been placed under his command. According to one part of the agreement he exercises control over their planning and over operations apart from operations in an emergency. The Minister of National Defence, on November 5, 1957, at page 758 of *Hansard* said in this House of Commons that General Partridge, after consultation with the two governments, could commit either Canadian or United States forces in the defence of this country. After consultation with the

[Mr. Pearson.]