

## NORAD—Canada-U.S. Agreement

this matter was one that was conducted almost entirely by the Minister of National Defence and possibly by the Prime Minister. I am sure that, otherwise, those in the Department of External Affairs would have come to the assistance of the Secretary of State for External Affairs, who had recently taken up his assignment, and would have seen to it that in matters involving Canada and another power the Secretary of State for External Affairs would have been entrusted with the political arrangements between Canada and that power.

**Mr. Smith (Hastings-Frontenac):** We have nothing in the department with respect to any military arrangements. I crave—

**Mr. Speaker:** If the hon. member is not asking a question, he may find that he has made his speech on this motion.

**Mr. Martin (Essex East):** I would have been very happy to allow my friend to intervene in a matter of such importance. It is only fair to any member who believes he has a contribution to make, to allow him to make it. However, the Secretary of State for External Affairs more than likely will have an opportunity later to participate in the debate.

We come back to last August and the announcement by the Minister of National Defence that Canada had agreed to an arrangement under which a distinguished United States air force officer was to be given command of the defence of the North American continent and a distinguished Canadian air officer was to be second in command. This arrangement involved the possible dispatch of Canadian forces outside Canada. It may be said that these forces will be confined to the continent of North America, but it is difficult to conceive that any such limit is as defined in the statement originally made by the Minister of National Defence. In any event, this does involve the potential use of Canadian forces outside Canada, and because of this the matter is one which, at the earliest moment, should have been submitted to parliament for its consideration.

**Mr. McPhillips:** How about Hong Kong?

**Mr. Martin (Essex East):** My hon. friend says, "What about Hong Kong?" I say, what about this particular agreement which likewise involves the lives of Canadian men and women?

Now, General Partridge, the commander, had a concept of his obligations and on September 6 in an interview, which by the way was shown to the Department of National Defence according to a reply given me by

[Mr. Martin (Essex East).]

the Minister of National Defence last November, indicated that as a result of an arrangement he had with the President of the United States there would not be any obligation on his part to consult with the government of the United States before pushing the button. The Minister of National Defence likewise said that General Partridge would have command not only over United States personnel but Canadian forces as well. Would General Partridge, the Minister of National Defence was asked, have a like authority in terms of Canadian forces? Would he be able to push the button without consulting the government of Canada? The Minister of National Defence replied there would have to be consultation with the political authority in Canada. How can that reply be correct? How could the statement of General Partridge be correct? Either the statement of General Partridge was wrong or the statement of the Minister of National Defence was inaccurate.

If General Partridge does not have to consult with the government of the United States, how could it be argued with any measure of success by the Minister of National Defence that the government of Canada, in such circumstances, would have to be consulted by the NORAD commander? In the absence of General Partridge, would the No. 2 in command have the same authority as General Partridge? The answer of the Minister of National Defence was yes. Would Air Marshal Slemon be able to act with respect to the United States forces just as General Partridge said he could, without consulting the government of the United States? Could Air Marshal Slemon act in that way with regard to the United States forces without consulting the government of the United States, but be unable to commit Canadian forces without consulting the government of Canada? Those are questions that have not yet been properly answered by the Minister of National Defence, indeed they were not even referred to by the Prime Minister today. Those are the kind of questions that are involved in the agreement that is before us now.

No one insists that the full terms of this agreement should be made available to the house, because obviously there are questions of security involved. However, questions of the sort to which I have referred surely are not in the realm of security. We ought to know now whether General Partridge was stating the correct position in so far as the government of Canada and the government of the United States are concerned or whether his statement does not harmonize with the policy of the government of Canada. Obviously, that kind of inconsistency must be