

Murphy, Slack, Stafford and Morgan. Representing Canada were Senators Cameron and O'Leary and from the House of Commons, Messrs. Cameron, McWilliam, Coates, Macquarrie, Brewin and Johnston.

The Committee considered the following items on its Agenda:

- 1) State of the NATO Alliance (with particular reference to the Harmel study)
- 2) Co-operation for continental defense
- 3) Policies toward Communist China
- 4) Vietnam
- 5) Non-proliferation Treaty

ELEVENTH MEETING
CANADA-UNITED STATES
INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP
REPORT OF COMMITTEE II:
DEFENSE AND SECURITY MATTERS

The U.S. Chairman opened the first session of the Committee on Defense and Security Matters by emphasizing that 1968 was a year for stock-taking and reassessment. He noted the current and forthcoming changes in political leadership in both countries, the urgent public demands by the population for re-examination of policies and the worldwide phenomenon of challenge to the past. He also noted that in 1968 it was necessary to consider the fact that the NATO treaty allowed for reassessment of its existence after 20 years and that the NORAD treaty between the U.S. and Canada was expiring on May 12, 1968. He then suggested that the Committee give its first attention to NATO, to an examination of the changing Soviet threat, the consequences of this changing threat to NATO itself, the demands for a reduction in troop levels, the effects of the non-proliferation treaty and the recommendations of the Harmel Report.

The majority of Canadian delegates supported the view that a new approach to the NATO Alliance was required and had been recommended by, among other things, the Harmel Report which called for positive action of NATO in the economic and political fields in addition to its traditional military role. It was pointed out that the Harmel Report emphasized that one of NATO'S major roles was to coordinate plans for promoting a detente and the question was asked as to whether or not NATO as it exists today can be used for such a purpose.

A Canadian delegate pointed out that although the official Canadian Government

position on NATO had not changed, NATO had become an alliance leading to considerable moral questioning on the part of the Canadian people.

The U.S. delegation noted the increased Soviet military threat in the Mediterranean; particularly that the Soviet Union had increased the number of submarines in that area and was looking to NATO'S defense in southern Europe as the soft part of the world. Italy particularly was reported to be very fearful of the possibility of a Soviet threat. The Soviet submarine fleet had developed greatly increased strength on a worldwide basis and was now able to extend its operations to long distances from its European home base. The Soviets are developing ship-borne surface-to-surface missiles and these could be a threat to surface ships of the U.S., U.K. and Canada.

The Soviet Union was beginning to use naval bases in the United Arab Republic and Syria, and there was a real possibility that it might be able to use bases in Algeria. Soviet technological developments enabled Soviet submarines to transit the exit from the Black Sea without technically violating the Soviet-Turkish agreement concerning the use of the Straits.

There was an interesting review of the apparent Soviet desire to control Middle Eastern oil resources if not for its own use then to deny it to the prime purchasers in Western Europe. One member of the U.S. delegation felt that while the Harmel report's recommendations for a detente were helpful, the new ingredient of an increased Soviet threat in the Mediterranean was so important that it could not be ignored.

Some concern was expressed by the Canadian delegation as to the consequences of control by the Soviet Union over the Middle East oil resources. An agreement seemed to have been reached that such control would create a very significant threat to the economies of Western Europe.

Another member of the U.S. delegation emphasized that the nature of the Soviet threat must also be evaluated in terms of the failure of the Soviet Union to give any indication of a willingness to seek a mutual troop reduction in central Europe despite proposals on this matter. In this connection, members of the U.S. delegation indicated that an assessment of possible U.S. troop reductions was currently in progress and would be discussed during the next few weeks.