

*North Atlantic Treaty*

declare either of the two acts I have mentioned to be inapplicable in respect of any associated state. Does that mean that, without such declaration, the provisions of those other acts are applicable to associated states? Surely they are not applicable, unless they are expressly declared to be so.

**Mr. Campney:** The two specific acts the hon. member mentioned are in each case respectively applicable only to the other named parties, the British commonwealth in the first place and the United States of America in the other. This measure will be generally applicable; but so long as these two statutes I have mentioned remain in force it may be necessary and desirable to have some parts of one or other of those acts apply in a specific case, and some parts of this act, as of any given time. In other words, while these other acts continue to exist, I believe the intention is to have this act parallel them, and thus make it possible for the governor in council to apply a piece of this act and a piece of that, if circumstances make it desirable to do so.

**Mr. Fulton:** Then the purpose of this is the exact reverse of what I understood. Do I understand the purpose is that there may be conditions which would make it desirable, instead of applying the Visiting Forces (British Commonwealth) Act to a commonwealth country, to apply this act instead? Therefore the governor in council would say, "Well, the Visiting Forces (British Commonwealth) Act is not applicable, but this one is applicable." Is that so?

**Mr. Campney:** I may say that this measure parallels in part the two specific acts to which reference has been made. But those two acts go very much further and cover a much wider field. They deal with many matters that are not considered in this bill. It may be desirable in a specific case to apply this measure, plus parts of either of the other acts. It is desired to maintain a position so that the governor in council may integrate the two, or utilize this act and some parts of either of the other acts in respect of the countries concerned.

**Mr. Fulton:** But this confers power on the governor in council to repeal or make inapplicable, with respect to a country with which we have entered into a treaty or agreement, sections of that agreement, or rather of the act implementing the agreement. I do not see why there is placed in this statute dealing with a new agreement a provision which, in effect, allows us to revoke the old agreement. I should be interested to know whether the possibility of revoking parts of the other agreements has been discussed with countries of the British commonwealth

and the United States, to which those other agreements relate. Also, why is the power to revoke them or to make them inapplicable put in this measure which approves a new treaty?

**Mr. Campney:** I might say that discussions are at present in progress in regard to the position of the two specific statutes referred to in this section. Meantime, until they are clarified and reconciled—because there are a number of intricate matters involved in this bill as well as in the other statutes—the intention is to keep parallel power in the governor in council; to make some parts of this act applicable, if desirable, and if those parts conflict with either of the other acts, to make such parts of those acts inapplicable. This is necessary in order that there will not be two attempts to deal with the same matter.

**Mr. Fulton:** That is what I wanted to know.

**Mr. Stick:** I should like to make some general remarks. In 1941 a defence treaty was entered into between Newfoundland, Canada, the United Kingdom and the United States. That was known as the protocol of March 27, 1941. An agreement was entered into during the war. This bill contains as a schedule the agreement between the parties to the North Atlantic treaty regarding the status of their forces. As I understand it, and I may be wrong, if we pass this bill with the schedule it will mean that the defence act will be amended, but does it mean also that the original agreement between Newfoundland, Canada, the United Kingdom and the United States with regard to bases in Newfoundland will be amended? There is also an arrangement between Canada and Newfoundland with regard to the Goose Bay airport. This matter is important as far as we are concerned, and I should like to have it clarified.

**Mr. Campney:** It is my understanding that the passage of this legislation would not automatically supersede or abrogate the existing leased bases agreement. I understand further that the interrelationship between and the effect of one upon the other are now the subject of study by the parties concerned. What the ultimate outcome will be when the discussions have been concluded I am unable to state.

**Mr. Stick:** I have not the record here, but I believe it was stated in the house when we were dealing with the agreement set out on page 10 that it was the result of negotiations that had been going on for two or three years with regard to the status of United States forces in Newfoundland. This matter should be clearly defined here so we will know