

On page 6 you say:

Does Canada really believe that West Germany is restrained from military adventures or from acquiring nuclear weapons simply because of the presence of NATO troops in Germany? Certainly West Germany puts no more faith in America's willingness to defend her by nuclear retaliation against Russia than does de Gaulle.

I would suggest that this is a statement which is just contrary to fact. Having had considerable dealings with the Minister of Defence of Germany, and having talked to their External Affairs Minister at considerable length on these subjects, I am personally completely convinced that Germany puts her security almost entirely in the fact that America is going to be willing to defend her. She looks upon the presence on German soil of a large number of American troops armed with nuclear weapons as her more or less complete guarantee, that in the event of a Communist attack on Germany, the Americans will participate in her defence.

**Professor McNaught:** Sir, that is certainly a point of sharp disagreement. It seems to me that a very strong case could be made that NATO provides, in some ways, a convenient defence for the West German Government to resist right-wing demands in Germany for a much more aggressive foreign policy. I would agree that far. But I do not find it at all convincing that the fact that there are as many thousands of American troops on German soil as there are, in any way adds to the credibility of a policy of the United States of repulsing an attack on West Germany by nuclear weapons.

**Mr. Harkness:** Then you would assume that in the event of an attack the Americans would just, we will say, abandon their troops that are there? This to me is inconceivable.

**Professor McNaught:** They are, of course, armed with strategic or tactical nuclear weapons which have a larger explosive blast than the Hiroshima bomb. If there is going to be a nuclear defence, they are going to be destroyed anyway. It seems to me that they are there as a very real kind of hostage, but one which cannot be reclaimed by the use of nuclear weapons.

In other words, it is, in fact, the same kind of mythology that we are led to accept, that there is a defence against that kind of attack. It seems to me that they are buying political influence in the same way that we attempt to buy political influence from the United States by staying in the military alliance.

• 1305

**Mr. Harkness:** Yes, this is your point of view. But you put forward in your paper here that the Germans

essentially have this point of view, that the Germans do not believe that the presence of these American forces there means that America is going to be willing to defend Germany by nuclear means, which I think is completely wrong, and which I am sure the Germans think is completely wrong.

**Professor McNaught:** There is a very great debate in Germany on it, and once again one is making hypothetical assumptions about the broad tenor of public opinion, and I do not think it can be tested perfectly on a factual basis. But certainly the unrest in Germany at the moment would suggest that there is a credibility gap there of rather large proportions.

**The Chairman:** Gentlemen, we still have several members who wish to ask questions, and unfortunately Professor McNaught can not be back this afternoon. So if you agree, we will continue until we complete the list of questioners.

Before calling the next questioner, would the Committee agree to print Professor McNaught's advance presentation as an appendix to this day's *Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence*? Agreed.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

**The Chairman:** Secondly, on February 5th Mr. Forrestall requested there be made available a list of all bilateral defence agreements in force between Canada and other states. Apparently there are 64 in all. A large majority are with the United States. Nine are with other NATO states, and 9 are with non-NATO states. All the agreements are of a highly technical nature. The Clerk has copies of the list available for any member who wants one immediately, but perhaps it would be helpful if we could print the list as an appendix to today's proceedings. Would that be agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

**Mr. Roberts:** Mr. Chairman, along the same lines, could the letter from which Professor McNaught quoted in his brief be appended too?

**Professor McNaught:** You mean the whole letter from the Department of Immigration?

**Mr. Roberts:** Yes.

**The Chairman:** It is a question of whether there is any objection on your part, Professor.

**Professor McNaught:** There is no objection on my part. I hope there is not on the part of the Department, since I have a copy of the letter if you would like to use it.