

In this respect the NATO force would enhance world peace (16-12-60). In 1963 the paper held the same opinion since "proliferation of independent deterrents would be intolerable. A wholly integrated NATO force with a workable chain of command is the most practicable solution." (23-5-63). In complete opposition to the Telegram's stand was the Toronto Star which was opposed to nuclear weapons in any form, and this meant both independent nuclear forces and a NATO force. Canada "should withdraw from NATO rather than participate in such schemes." (2-4-61). In 1964 the Star held the same opinion since the MLF had "no military value" and could "endanger the essential American veto over the use of nuclear weapons." (22-9-64).

While papers like the Montreal Gazette (24-11-60), 20-11-61) and the Halifax Chronicle Herald (29-11-60), 26-11-64) took a fairly strong stand in opposition to a NATO nuclear force, the majority of papers were willing to follow much the same pattern as the Government. The overall impression is one of not getting Canada committed any further. This may well have been the best decision in the light of present attitudes toward the Canadian role in NATO on the part of some elements within the attentive public. Participation certainly would have complicated any renegotiation of Canada's role. After this brief survey of attitudes toward any further military commitments, it is now possible to turn to the present Canadian role in Europe.

The question of present European commitments to NATO seems to be in a state of flux, and according to some commentators this is partly a result of uncertainty on the part of the Government over Canada's future role in NATO. Needless to say these two aspects are closely linked, and in some cases the stand taken on troops in Europe reflects the opinion of the paper on the future of NATO, and vice versa. To pro-NATO supporters table No. 11 certainly presents an unsettling picture since 50% of the papers do not support the Government's present position. In terms of support this is the lowest overall rating of the six issues, and at the same time is the most indicative of present support for NATO. Of equal importance is that papers, such as the Toronto Globe and Mail, the Edmonton Journal, and the Windsor Star, which have supported Government policy in the past have indicated doubts about NATO policy.

As was the case with the majority of other issues, the papers showing the greatest support for maintaining troops in Europe are the Ottawa Citizen, the Winnipeg Free Press, and the Saint John Telegraph Journal. In an editorial on May 6, 1967 the Citizen noted the pending U.S. and U.K. withdrawals, but felt they would not weaken the alliance since the foreign exchange problem would be lessened. The Canadian situation, however, is different because our balance of payments position is strong, and the 11,000 troops in Europe do not make that much of a difference. Furthermore, our present commitments are now at a minimum to be creditable. In the future it may be possible to reduce the force, but not unless there is a substantial reduction of Warsaw Pact troops. The Citizen position was in agreement with an earlier Free Press editorial. The argument that Canada can thin out its troops proportionately to the U.S. is not valid because of the relative size involved. "Any reduction of the Canadian force would render it useless," and Canada "cannot withdraw, even under the disguise of a troop reduction, without betraying its basic commitments." (29-3-67). For the St. John paper "cutting NATO forces would be a