

But no sooner had Mr. Hellyer and Mr. Martin reaffirmed the Government's position on NATO than Walter Gordon, in a speech at the University of Western Ontario, suggested Canada withdraw from Europe. "We may wonder whether Canada should continue to maintain air squadrons and a brigade in Europe any longer." He went on to imply that the sensible thing to do would be a complete withdrawal from NATO, but this was ambiguously worded.<sup>49</sup> While Walter Gordon's position undoubtedly has some support within the Liberal party, it seems that the position taken by Mr. Hellyer and Mr. Martin will prevail - at least for several years. Therefore, the general Liberal position in late 1967 can be summed up as favouring both the maintenance of troops in Europe, with some reduction, and a change in role in line with the proposals of the 1964 White Paper.

At the same time the Conservatives had their equivalent to Walter Gordon. On January 11, 1967 the former Minister of External Affairs, Howard Green, in an article to the Vancouver Sun questioned the value of stationing troops in Europe. According to Mr. Green, West Germany was powerful enough to defend herself, (Of course this begs the entire question of the NATO 'control' function.<sup>50</sup>) and "our troops could be just as useful to NATO if based in Canada" in the role of mobile reserve. After all "they might even be needed to defend Canada's West Coast if China continues on her aggressive course." The Green article was not supported in the House of Commons, and those MP's that spoke on the subject supported in principle the necessity of stationing troops in Europe; but there was also mention of the need to change the NATO role. Mr. Harkness felt "Canada's defence policy primarily must be based on strong support for NATO and a willingness on our part to make a proportionate contribution to its strength...."<sup>51</sup> The main party debate over NATO, however, did not take place in the House.

At the Montmorency thinkers conference Party President Dalton Camp, in a very perceptive speech, raised the question of foreign policy alternatives. An alternative to keeping troops in Europe exists, but it would mean a re-alignment of Canadian foreign policy. For the present, however, Camp was willing to opt for a "psychological buttress" in Europe which obviously meant a greatly reduced role, while the Camp position represented the minority view at the Conference no consensus was reached on the question on stationing troops in Europe. The final report took the position "that Canada should maintain armed forces sufficient to meet its obligations under collective security agreement..." But no mention was made of troops in Europe.<sup>52</sup>

While the party hierarchy - Stanfield, Roblin and Diefenbaker (took the firmest stand) - called for a reappraisal of the NATO role, none would go as far as Camp in advocating reduction of NATO troops. Further to the stand taken by party leaders, the policy thinkers group at the Leadership Convention in September rejected the Camp position, but noted that roles and commitments would have to be re-negotiated as circumstances change.<sup>53</sup> Therefore, the Conservatives seem to be in a period of flux, and it is to be expected that in the near future the party position will be clarified with the election of Mr. Stanfield as party leader. On the whole, there seems to be qualified support for