

it not? Together with the United States it was decided that the bomber force would be looked after by them; this was too big an undertaking for Canada, and so we stuck to the fighter role. In this particular instance do you not think that Canada is too small a nation to take on all of the aspects of defence, including the naval one?

Mr. Golden: Surely, it is true to say that even in this area we by no means cover all aspects of naval warfare; even there we have limited ourselves to a couple of the quite numerous options which are open, whereas, of course, the United States feels it must exercise all options.

Mr. Stewart, my difficulty is that I really do not know too much about the nature of the Canadian contribution on the naval side in relation to what one would expect in the early 1970s to get, dollar for dollar.

Mr. Stewart (Cochrane): Fine. Thank you very much, Mr. Golden. I thought maybe I could get you to agree with me.

The Chairman: Mr. Thompson?

Mr. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Golden, I find paragraph 4 on page 4 to be a very interesting statement. I must confess that I have to agree with the preliminary statement of Mr. Stewart on his reaction to this paper as it might be compared with others we have had recently.

We will be going to Europe with the basic purpose of trying to gain a deeper viewpoint of the NATO responsibility from over there. You say that there is no more important defence role that Canada can play than that in North America. What relationship exists between the defence of North America and the defence of Europe through NATO and our responsibility to that aspect of it, in your opinion?

• 1130

Mr. Golden: I think there are two relationships. First of all, there probably exists a relationship in the Canadian mind which, in my view, is paramount. Secondly, there is a relationship which exists in the minds of the United States, which, I would say, comes second. In Canada we tend to think of our role in North America and our role in NATO in both cases as measures for collective defence; and I believe that is correct. Perhaps when you go down to Washington you will find that there are many people who think

the Canadian role in NATO also has an influence on the attitude which other members of NATO might hold and that consequently in Washington there will be, or there is, among some people, a feeling that the Canadian role is important not only for itself but also for the effect it will have on decisions which other members in NATO might take in the future.

Mr. Thompson (Red Deer): Leaving the attitude of the United States towards what influence we might have on some of the other NATO members, what is your thought in regard to that responsibility as it relates to, shall we say the smaller European members of NATO such as Norway, Denmark, Holland, Belgium and even down at the southeast end, Turkey and Greece?

Mr. Golden: I believe in NATO. I believe that it is an alliance which has been absolutely essential. I believe it should continue. I believe Canada should continue to be a member of NATO. My difficulty arises when I try to analyse what forces Canada should put at the disposal of NATO in the context of the kind of budget that we have been talking about.

I also believe that we have not taken sufficient account of the changed character of Europe between 1950 and 1970. At the time that we talked about going into NATO, Europe was almost prostrate after the war. Canada not only had not been touched physically but in fact it had an incredible expansion of its industry and for a short while—a period which I must say I think some people do not seem to realize is now gone—for a short while we were one of the great military powers in the world, and it seems to me it was quite appropriate that we should at that time have shouldered the burden in NATO that we did. I feel that that kind of burden in relation to the other tasks which we now are called upon to perform is no longer appropriate. In my view it is a question of degree rather than of getting out or staying in.

Mr. Thompson (Red Deer): From your knowledge of the policies and attitudes of some of the smaller countries of Europe that I have just mentioned, do you think the most logical approach, in trying to work out what would be Canada's role in its commitment to NATO, should be in close consultation with the smaller countries of NATO, and that their attitudes are even more important, shall we say, than the attitudes of the United