

## NORAD—Canada-U.S. Agreement

this distinguished leader of the west, the secretary general of NATO, has been brought into this political debate. Wherein did the surprise and astonishment that I experienced arise? The Leader of the Opposition read from what he told us was a transcript taken from a tape recording of the press conference that Mr. Spaak held when he was here. The extract taken from that press conference and the observations of Mr. Spaak read as follows:

Q. Mr. Spaak, you said just now that NATO was—I cannot make out the word.

—looking with interest at NORAD. Do you consider NORAD part of NATO?

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

Speaking for myself, as that was uttered by the Leader of the Opposition I was left with the impression that Mr. Spaak had said it was not part of NATO; but if you read as is printed in *Hansard* these words, "No, it is not under the command of NATO", that is something different from the impression that was left. Some of us did not have the opportunity to see the manuscript to which the Leader of the Opposition referred.

But now that the name of Mr. Spaak has been brought into this debate, I can say that he himself personally told me that he got rather mixed up in the press interview. He did make at least two subsequent statements that qualified the impression that was made in the press conference. I am confident that the Leader of the Opposition must have known of the qualification. I could refer to a meeting we both attended. Although Mr. Spaak made the qualification in French, I am sure the French of the Leader of the Opposition is better than mine but I understood that he was qualifying his statement on that particular occasion. But I go to the public press. I am reading an excerpt from a clipping from the *Halifax Chronicle Herald* that appeared on June 4. Mr. Spaak is quoted and the remarks are in quotation marks:

NORAD is not the direct concern of the NATO authorities in Paris as SACEUR, SACLANT and the Channel command are—

This government has never claimed that NORAD was a command of NATO. We agree with that statement. But then he goes on to say this:

—but the military plans of NORAD are known to the standing group and the military committee—

The two committees senior to NORAD under NATO, under the NATO council.

—through the Canada-U.S. regional planning group and studied there—

The Canada-United States regional planning group is an integral—as I said on

May 19 in this house—or an integrated organization within NATO. It is organic and it has definite responsibilities under the NATO general organization. But I repeat that part again:

—but the military plans of NORAD are known to the standing group and the military committee through the Canada-U.S. regional planning group and studied there—

It is not just have been informed; not just have been reported—comments were made in the house on the word "informed"—they are studied there.

—thus supplying a base for co-ordination between the plans made by the supreme commanders directly under the standing group and the plans of NORAD.

Mr. Speaker, if they are studied in the standing group and they do not seem to fit into the general over-all defence plans and defensive plans, retaliatory plans of NATO, then there will be discussion of them with the members of the Canada-United States regional planning group. It is in this context therefore that NORAD's role in the general framework of the over-all defence of the North Atlantic treaty area can be justified. This particular group, the Canada-United States regional planning group, is made up of the chiefs of staff of the United States and the chiefs of staff of Canada or, to give them their technical titles or designations, the chiefs of staff committee of Canada and the joint chiefs of staff of the United States. That personnel is identical with the personnel of the group also mentioned in the note, the group to whose component parts the commander in chief of NORAD is responsible. Last evening the Leader of the Opposition stated that the commander in chief of NORAD would have a dual responsibility. I do not think of it in that way. He will be responsible to the joint chiefs of staff of the United States and, not or,—studying together, working together—the chiefs of staff committee of Canada.

I come back to this point that was referred to by the last speaker who said that he would like to be satisfied about political control. I am not going to repeat what I said in the house on May 19 when I traced the political responsibility of the commander in chief of NORAD. He reports to this joint group, the same personnel who are on this planning group, an organic part of NATO. Then they are responsible to their two governments. They must review such proposals and the governments will be bound to accept, and of course accept readily, the responsibility of examining the proposals that are put up to them coupled with recommendations and confirmation that those are militarily acceptable proposals. There is a line of political responsibility. Also the terms of