

NORAD—Canada-U.S. Agreement

would not attempt to relieve his political flatulence by making the rude verbal remarks he makes when I am speaking.

The Canadian government's formal acceptance of the integration of the air defence of North America under a United States military commander is of historical importance. I think we all can agree on that. For the first time in our history during peacetime a Canadian government has placed units of our armed forces under the direct command of a single foreign power. The gravity of such a step alone would warrant a most careful investigation and discussion of the facts by members of this house. It is for that reason, that we in this group were very pleased when the Prime Minister agreed to have a debate on this most important resolution. It was unpardonable, in our opinion, that the government in the first instance refused until they had been subjected to pressure from the opposition benches to permit a discussion of the exchange of these important diplomatic notes with the United States. I do not wish to dwell further on this point since it is the intention of one of my colleagues to discuss it at some greater length later in the debate.

I do want, however, to discuss the government's pretext for saying that a debate on NORAD was not necessary because it constituted an amplification of and extension under the North Atlantic Treaty. I am referring specifically to a statement made in the house on May 19 by the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Smith), who declared that the government regards this as an amplification of and extension under the North Atlantic Treaty. This statement can be found at page 192 of *Hansard* for May 19, 1958.

In the first place, even if these arrangements were only an extension of the North Atlantic Treaty, this house would still be entitled to debate them in the same manner, for example, as the extension of NATO to include Greece and Turkey was subject to the approval of this parliament. However, the highest civilian official of the NATO organization, the secretary general, has been quoted by newspapermen to the effect that the North American air defence arrangements are not part of NATO. The Prime Minister has suggested or inferred that the secretary general was misquoted by the press. The truth of the matter was established when the Leader of the Opposition placed on the record this afternoon some quotations from the tape recording taken of the interview with the secretary general of NATO. These prove that the newspaper statements were, in substance, correct.

[Mr. Herridge.]

However, be that as it may, it is quite clear from the wording of the diplomatic notes that the NORAD command will not report, at least directly, nor will it have to answer to the North Atlantic Treaty military command. The note from the Canadian embassy in Washington speaks for itself. It speaks most clearly in dealing with this point, and I quote:

The North Atlantic Treaty organization will continue to be kept informed through the Canada-United States regional planning group of arrangements for the air defence of North America.

I do not think, under any circumstances, in view of that statement one could claim that this organization was integrated or a part of the structure of NATO.

Mr. Pallett: What about the fourth paragraph of that note?

Mr. Herridge: Another speaker will deal with the fourth paragraph and you too, if you say too much.

I suggest that there is a major difference between keeping the NATO command informed as such and in reporting directly to and being responsible to that command. In this note there is nothing to indicate that the NORAD command will be in any way responsible to the NATO command. Indeed, the note simply states—and I quote again—as follows:

The commander-in-chief NORAD will be responsible to the chiefs of staff committee of Canada and the joint chiefs of staff of the United States, who in turn are responsible to their respective governments. He will operate within a concept of air defence approved by the appropriate authorities of our two governments, who will bear in mind their objectives in the defence of the Canada-United States region as a NATO area.

Nothing in my opinion, could be plainer than that this is nothing more than a bilateral arrangement, an arrangement between two countries which are members of NATO, exclusive of all the other partners of that multilateral organization. That is one reason why we in this group had certain misgivings with respect to this NORAD agreement and the NORAD arrangement. NORAD has been represented to the Canadian public as a purely defensive arrangement, an integration of Canadian and United States service units for the purpose of defending this continent against assault on the polar regions. United States military authorities, however, have never tried to hide the fact that NORAD is an integral part of a larger military organization which includes offensive as well as defensive arrangements.

The United States strategic air command, popularly known as SAC, is a powerful offensive weapon capable of being employed