

like 120 or 130 divisions in those countries, whereas the number of our divisions was much less and, of course, Canada's part was only a brigade. I think our brigade was attached to a British division, although I am not sure, and our air force was attached to the American air force. We really had no separate command of our own in France or in NATO.

My two questions then, are: has there been an adjustment made which is satisfactory to NATO; and, are we relying on the nuclear deterrent and the force deterrent as well—that is, do they interlock?

Hon. Mr. MARTIN: The immediate answer to your last question, Senator Brooks, is "yes"—that as well as the other military contribution that NATO can make.

Now, when the French announced that they did not intend to take part in integrated force structure or in integrated command structure, and asked the United States and Canada to vacate their bases—and this we will do, by the way, by April 1 in accord with the imposition placed on us by the French Government—this left open, of course, the question of what happens to the whole infrastructure, including the whole pipe line system that has been laboriously and expensively built up.

Senator BROOKS: Yes, and just on that point, it is billions of dollars, I understand, and not just millions.

Hon. Mr. MARTIN: I cannot give you the exact cost, but it is a very expensive structure. Now, we have made some progress, but I am not in a position, publicly, to say what the collective attitude will be with regard to this pipe line arrangement in France, this infrastructure arrangement in France, or what compensation we might seek in lieu thereof.

Senator BROOKS: From whom would you seek compensation?

Hon. Mr. MARTIN: From France. France has the responsibility along with the rest of us for this. Just to leave this would be unfair to our economic and military interests. When I say our, I mean NATO's interests. But this question is tied in with many other questions, such as the right to over-flight. It is tied in with what ultimate disposition will be made for French forces in Germany.

The French Government, after saying they were no longer going to support integrated force structure did say they wanted their forces in Germany to stay. The West German Government in turn said that they would welcome the continued presence of those forces, but that their continued presence would have to be consistent with the presence in Germany of other NATO forces.

We are now in a process of negotiating through SACEUR, the Supreme Allied Command Europe, and the French military authorities the actual basis of the continued presence in Germany of French forces, and also the relationship which those forces will have to NATO.

France has said that it continues to be obligated to Article 5 of the treaty. Article 5 provides for automatic commitment to common defence. The exact contribution that France will be prepared to make in time of war as opposed to emergency is a matter that is now the subject of very considerable negotiations between the fourteen and France. These are underway at the moment, and we are making some progress but we are not yet at the stage where I would be at liberty to give the full details.

Senator BROOKS: What about the reference to nuclear power?

Hon. Mr. MARTIN: All countries do not share in the nuclear capacity of NATO. There are three nuclear powers in the organization, Britain, France and the United States. There are some countries like Canada that have a dual role where independent international control continues to reside with the main nuclear power, the United States. But the nuclear deterrent does continue to be a very important governing factor in NATO strength, particularly when you take