

having decided that it does not make much difference whether you put in 30 per cent or whether you put in 50 per cent, you are only going to do a small amount anyway. You want to make a substantial contribution, and as far as the Americans are concerned I cannot see how they are particularly concerned whether we put in either 30 or 50 per cent, provided we play a role in Europe which again is in the common North Atlantic interest. This is not a very good question, sir, but I cannot see why you have suggested that our influence on the Americans and our influence on and ability to affect American policy is entirely dependent upon what we do in North America. It seems to me that it would be what we do in both areas.

**Mr. Golden:** On the contrary, I think it is a very good question. Of course, this is the sort of thing that one runs up against all the time. You have limited resources and you have to try to decide what to do with them. First, when I talk about only a Canada which shares in North American defence, and which has forces which it can commit to such defence, can influence in any important way American policy, I mean American policy in North America. I do not mean American policy locally. That brings me to the difficulty I have in this respect. When you talk about independence and sovereignty you can only relate it to Canada as a physical thing. When you talk about Canadian forces in Europe you are talking about a contribution to an alliance where we may or may not play an appropriate role, depending on one's views. There is no question about it, the United States is most anxious we should play that role and the reasons are well understood.

Perhaps what is not so well understood, in my view, is that there are more compelling Canadian reasons than there are American reasons why we should play an appropriate role in North America. It is not important to their sovereignty what happens in northern Quebec or northern Ontario, it is our sovereignty that is involved, and that is why I am making this distinction. I agree with you that it would pay dividends, in the sense of having an influence on policy, if we had appropriate military forces in Europe, but my assessment of doing that and all the other things that we are talking about doing is that it would require a larger defence budget than we have today. If such is the decision, so be it. I have no objection at all. In fact, I think that is

fine. I think perhaps the Canadian contribution to defence is getting smaller than it should be in relation to the obligations we might properly assume, I do not know. I have no objection to what you have said at all; it is just a question of how you get all this in. When I talk about sovereignty and independence I am quite aware of the fact that many Americans have said—whether they speak for the United States government or not, I do not know—“Do not worry about what goes on in NORAD. You stay in Europe”. I think that is quite a defensible American view. However, I regard it as an indefensible Canadian view. To me it is important for Canada that these things not happen, whether it is important to the United States or not.

**Mr. Anderson:** So you therefore think that the political advantages that accrue for Canada may be direct advantages by working with European nations and the ability we have to work in concert with those nations on the United States is not perhaps more valuable than for instance, increasing the number of Canadian aircraft in Canada and decreasing the number of American. In other words, we gain more by increasing our contribution from my hypothetical figures of 30 per cent up to 50 per cent than we would lose in Europe?

**Mr. Golden:** I take it we are definitely speaking in hypothetical figures because I doubt that we would make anything like that contribution to North American defence, or that we are ever likely to.

I cannot quarrel with your assessment. I believe in the importance of an inviolate Europe. I believe that it is important to Canada that Europe not be overrun. I believe that Canada should remain a member of the NATO alliance. Of course, circumstances may change and it might be vital that we make a major military contribution, but I do not see it today in relation to the forces and resources which appear to be at our disposal. It may be there are many aspects of government policy in this regard that I do not understand, and this would not be the first time. However, I do not see much evidence that a major increase in the defence budget is in contemplation, and in relation to what can be done with a somewhat depreciated dollar I put a greater importance, for Canadian reasons, in these fields. I would not downgrade the advantages that can be gained by Canada