

NORAD—Canada-U.S. Agreement

particular issue. We would be in a much better position if the statements emanating from the government benches were consistent and not contradictory. We would have an idea of just where we are going on this particular item.

There is another reference to this plan that I should like to quote. At page 1029 of *Hansard*, the Minister of National Defence is apparently referring to a question by the hon. member for Essex East (Mr. Martin), and said:

The hon. member who has just sat down wanted to know why we did not bring this note before the house last October. He gave the answer himself—the note had not been completed, it had not been worked out, and what is the use of bringing a half-baked scheme before parliament and taking up the time of the house before it is completed?

Apparently the reference was to some half-baked scheme the Liberal party had in mind but which had not reached a state of culmination yet, as the Prime Minister put it. If what we have before us is anything more than a half-baked scheme, then I do not know what it is. It is not only half-baked, it is still in the raw state. We are being asked to swallow this concoction without any idea what it is. We have the Prime Minister substantiating our claim it is a half-baked scheme, as the Minister of National Defence indicated to us it was.

Mr. Pallett: Certainly, the hon. member would recognize one.

Mr. Howard: I do not mind the interruptions if they are made loudly enough for us to hear.

Mr. Pallett: I merely submitted to the hon. member that he would be able to recognize any sort of half-baked scheme.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Rea): If the hon. member is asking a question he should ask the hon. member who has the floor whether or not he will accept the question.

Mr. Howard: At page 993 of *Hansard*, near the bottom of the page, we have the Prime Minister admitting that this document which was tabled by the Secretary of State for External Affairs is nothing more than a half-baked scheme because he said:

Indeed, on March 11, 1957, 40 copies of a submission to the cabinet committee on defence were approved by the Minister of National Defence and forwarded to the secretary of the cabinet defence committee for inclusion on the agenda of the meeting of that committee to be held on Friday, March 15. No action was taken thereon. The agreement into which we have entered represents, in almost complete measure—when I say almost complete measure there are slight deviations in terminology and in routine matters—that which had been, to all intents and purposes, agreed upon by the former minister of national defence on behalf of the then government.

[Mr. Howard.]

In March, 1957, this half-baked scheme had been prepared. There was a slight change in terminology, and then that self-same half-baked scheme is presented to this house for acceptance.

Let us get back to NORAD and NATO.

An hon. Member: Yes.

Mr. Howard: Yes, you would like to do that I am sure.

An hon. Member: You wrote that part yourself.

Mr. Howard: My hearing aid must be turned down because I cannot hear these interruptions. If it is the intention of the government to have this half-baked scheme as part of NATO, which apparently they indicate is desirable, but other than in the straight reportorial fashion that NORAD reports to NATO—I do not know in what fashion they do that—then, we are going to give you every opportunity to make such an arrangement. Instead of the government asking us to buy a pig in a poke, which is what they are doing at the moment, we hope the government will exhibit sincerity—not that they have not done so in the past—by indicating support for the following amendment:

That the motion be amended by adding thereto the following words:

And in the opinion of this house consideration of the interests of collective security and the principles of the United Nations make it advisable for the government to give consideration to the taking of such steps as are necessary to integrate these agreements within the structure of NATO.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Rea): I do not believe this amendment is relative, but I should like permission of the house to leave that decision for Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Howard: Yes, that is agreed. I have completed my remarks.

Hon. Sidney E. Smith (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of traversing the ground that was covered so completely and, may I say, so clearly by the Prime Minister (Mr. Diefenbaker) with respect to the question of the relationship of NORAD to NATO. I made a statement in this house on May 19 to the effect that I consider NORAD an amplification of and extension under NATO. I must say very faithfully that nothing I have heard in this debate has changed my mind with respect to the validity of that statement.

I must say very frankly that I was surprised, and indeed astonished, by the observations made in the debate last evening by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Pearson) when he brought into this house the name of Mr. Spaak. I regret very much that the name of