

minds that Canadians are different from Americans and have different roles.

**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):** On what basis, though?

**Mr. Golden:** I think they accept the fact that we are a sovereign, independent country and that we have independently come to the conclusion that there are a lot of things the Americans are doing that make sense and we want to be associated with them. I do not believe that because we agree with the United States that necessarily means we are being subservient or not exercising independent judgment.

• 1225

**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):** May I just ask one final question? The question is short, but perhaps I may be asking for too long an answer, but do you think that the military-political situation has really altered substantially since the late nineteen-fifties?

**Mr. Golden:** I suppose it has altered; everything changes. I suppose what you are asking me to address myself to is whether it has altered in any meaningful way. Certainly the economic recovery of Europe and its capacity to participate in its own defence has grown with astonishing rapidity in the last 10 years. I would regard that as a meaningful change. I would regard the ability of the nations of Europe and their desire to contribute to their own defence has altered in a meaningful way in the last 10 years.

**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):** If I may just add this as a sort of supplementary, are there areas in which the threat has altered—if I can use that term—the potential military threat, say, to this country? Has it altered or shifted from one area of the world to another?

**Mr. Golden:** I am not an expert Kremlin-watcher or Sinologist or whatever they call them these days and my views are no more valuable than any average citizen's. Every time I think things are getting better something horrible happens and makes me reconsider. I do not know whether other people have that experience or not.

**The Chairman:** Thank you. Mr. Anderson, and then Mr. Ryan.

**Mr. Anderson:** Mr. Golden, I would like to congratulate you on your brief and lucid

statement. It contrasts sharply with some that we have had quite recently, but there is one aspect that I am afraid is not too clear to me and that is in paragraph 4 of page 4 which reads in part:

4. As far as independence is concerned, only a Canada which shares in North American defence and which has forces it can commit to such defence can influence in any important way, American policy.

While I will certainly accept that as a preliminary statement, it seems to me that if we devote a certain amount of our defence expenditure to North American defence in the agreements as you suggested we should do we should also at the same time attempt, perhaps, to play some part in Europe in NATO which would also aid, if you like, in the general defence of the North Atlantic area. In my opinion, a direct attack in Europe or a war in Europe would probably mean war in North America as well. It would quickly become global and I cannot see why you think that our influence is directly dependent upon the amount that we contribute in North America.

I would have thought that our influence would be directly dependent on the amount we contribute not only in North America but also in Europe, and there is not much difference one way or another where we put our troops from this point of view.

Having said that, of course, I come to the next part of my own private thesis which is that perhaps for specifically Canadian interests we should make a fairly large contribution in Europe where we have the opportunity of working with other nations of similar background, nations with which we have ties other than the United States and thus, in concert with those nations, perhaps have more influence on American policy than we might have in a strictly bilateral NORAD-type arrangement, North-South.

I am sorry this is such an involved question but I am really explaining an attitude which I would like you to comment on. You stated on page 3 in paragraph 1 that our contribution in North America need not be 100 per

• 1230

cent or even close to that, but it must be a great deal more than zero. I will agree with that, but it seems to me that once you assume that we are only going to carry out something like 30 to 50 per cent of the actual defence of North America, and the Canadian zone, once