

was once considered perhaps the area of the least stability has now become one of the areas of most stability; and that some force should be maintained there as a positive demonstration of the intention of the countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to stand together in the maintenance of the integrity of their own boundary. Now, I do not think this is incompatible with the philosophy of increased mobility. First of all, we have only part of our force in Europe and the mobility we are talking about applies to the whole force and particularly that part of it stationed in Canada which previously has not been available for reinforcement either of the NATO area in an emergency, or for deployment in other parts of the world in a time frame that might be realistic: (a) because we did not have the equipment for it, and (b) because we did not have the strategic mobility to get it there. So I do not think the two concepts are in conflict and I do feel that, for political reasons, for military reasons and also for training reasons, there is a good case for Canada to continue to maintain an effective contribution in Europe.

Now, I do not say it cannot be changed; I do not say it cannot be altered in any way, because it can be, and as a matter of fact this is the time, as we are looking to force commitments for the next three year period, when these things are under examination, but I do feel and I think this feeling reflects accurately the position of the government that we will have to continue to maintain an effective force there as our contribution for some period to come.

Mr. WINCH: I would like to continue this, but I must not abuse the privilege of other members.

The CHAIRMAN: We do have a number of other questioners, but first of all we have Mr. Smith on another supplementary.

Mr. SMITH: I think perhaps now my question becomes slightly repetitious. No one quarrels with the policy, with the effectiveness or the necessity of Canada supporting NATO, but I do think the question that remains in many people's minds is how effective is our military support. Has any really realistic look been taken to see whether or not we could not support NATO more effectively with a modified or changed military role, with the decreasing importance and the decreasing numbers of the Starfighters and their replacement by intermediate range missiles doing what they were doing and the withdrawal of French troops from NATO? Has consideration been given to the fact that we could have a vastly increased air transport capability and keep a much larger part of our troops home, we could still keep a presence in Europe.

Is active study or active consideration being given to that? You will note in the C.B.C. news yesterday morning there was an announcement from the American Defence Department of the great success of the scheme that they have been carrying on in southern Europe by flying the troops right from the states to Europe and how many thousands they were able to transport quickly. Are we giving the same consideration to our problem or is our brigade still rather squatted with a great many men and a large tail right in the middle of Germany?

Mr. HELLYER: Well, on the first question, as you know studies were initiated following the council of ministers here in Ottawa in 1963 as to what the force posture of NATO should be for future years, and these studies have been going on ever since. They have not reached the sort of finality that would give you the