

In the military field, the second day was devoted to a consideration of military questions. I think the most significant feature of that discussion was the suggestion by the United States that there is now ample deterrent capability on the Western side. Of course there is great deterrent power on the Communist side as well, with the result that it is very unlikely that either of the great nuclear powers would wish to precipitate a nuclear war and the resulting terrible destruction that would ensue. Thus it follows that the crises are likely to be of a nature not quite serious enough to precipitate a nuclear war. In other words, the Communists may go just so far that they do not actually precipitate a nuclear war.

There is a realization that NATO forces could be improved considerably to deal with that type of situation. In Europe there are, of course, some proposals for a European nuclear deterrent in the shape of medium-range ballistic missiles. This question was not decided. It will be studied further by the Council. It involves great expenditures; these missiles cost a great deal of money, and I think the European nations would be expected to provide a good deal of the cold, hard cash for such a deterrent. There would also be the question of control, how they would be handled and so on. The Europeans seem to favour land-based medium-range ballistic missiles, while the United States is more interested in having such a force at sea.

With regard to the conventional forces, there was a plea made by the United States for strengthening them, but this would not apply to Canada; in effect the proposal was made to the European nations. . . . Canada strengthened her conventional forces a year ago at the time of the Berlin crisis. We were very pleased to have it pointed out, not by ourselves but by the military authorities and the United States, that Canada had lived up to her commitments and, for example, that our brigade was the only combat-ready unit in the NATO forces other than those of the United States. In spite of rumours which I have seen in the press at home since my return, there was not a word of criticism of Canada's military efforts in NATO.

There was also a discussion on research development and production. As you know . . . in NATO Canada has always been in favour of sharing arrangements for this type of development, and the Minister of National Defence made a statement to that effect in the course of the discussions.

Finally there was a discussion about special aid to Greece to help with her defence expenditures. She is unable to continue the heavy expenses to which she is committed, and all the nations, or most of them in any event, are now arranging to give her some help with her defence costs. For example, Canada, in 1963, subject to Parliamentary approval, will provide \$1 million in the way of spare parts for planes which Canada supplied to Greece at an earlier date, and also \$1 million in the shape of foodstuffs for the Greek army. Greece is a strong, close friend of Canada, and is very grateful to us for taking this position.

It was agreed that the next meeting, which takes place in the spring, will