

## NATO

represents several months of concentrated effort on the part of 30 men, not to mention 16 eminent witnesses from the academic and other fields in Canada and from as far away as Germany.

I think the questions and the arguments that developed were sound. The witnesses placed well thought out positions before the committee and these were deeply considered by members of the committee. The headings in the report are indicative of the extent to which witnesses and members went in trying to arrive at some rational conclusion on what Canada's defence posture should be in relation to NATO.

The committee dealt briefly with Canada's membership in the United Nations. We indicated to this house and to the country that we did not feel Canada was directly menaced by any threat of invasion, and that the threat to Canada lay elsewhere, primarily in Europe. We reviewed our existing alliances. I hope that the Minister of National Defence will include these in his review because I doubt if there is a living Canadian who can recite all 47 of them.

We dealt with NATO, with its history and its provisions. We were all very much aware of the role that Canada had to play within the terms of that alliance. We were all aware that we were not committed to send troops to Europe. We touched on NORAD and indicated to the people of Canada that members of the committee had not agreed on any definitive roles in this context. We felt the committee should go further into this matter in the near future. Our present military contribution to NATO was thoroughly reviewed, both here at home and by a physical tour of Europe.

● (5:50 p.m.)

We dealt with the question of neutrality for Canada. I might say I was pleased to see the government's rejection of this as an optional role for Canada at this particular time. I am one of those who has long believed we cannot afford the luxury of neutrality. We went on to deal with the question of whether or not Canada should rely on the United States for its sole protection. Here, we get closer to the matters with which I should like to deal. The presentations made before the committee in some part—not in whole because there was considerable opposition to this—argued that Canada could substantially reduce the amount of money presently being spent on defence because the geographic proximity of the United States makes it necessary for the

[Mr. Forrestall.]

United States, in a sense, to defend Canada in order to defend itself. This was referred to I think as the so-called "free ride" theory. These arguments were rejected by the committee. Quite to the contrary, there is a conviction among all members of the committee I am sure, and among most Canadians with whom I have had an opportunity to discuss this, that Canada should be prepared to incur its fair and reasonable share of military responsibility in the world. Particularly, we must be prepared to do that and indeed are prepared to do that, so far as our relations with the United States are concerned.

The question of foreign aid being substituted for defence expenditures was rejected by the committee. I indicate to the minister, as he is probably well aware, that this is a question the committee probably will want to examine in some depth at a very early opportunity. The question of our peacekeeping role has been dealt with. In this connection the minister surely is well aware, much more so than the members of the committee, of the difficulty in pursuing this as a primary line of defence posture for Canada.

This leads us to the impact of the effect of Canada's alliance membership, not only our political affiliation but our full role within our means within the integrated military structure of NATO. In our report at page 35, the second last paragraph, there is this conclusion:

—Canada's influence with other nations of the world, including the non-aligned and developing nations—

The so-called third world.

—will be determined more by the degree of independence, objectivity and fairness which Canada exhibits in its relations with other countries than by its alliance associations.

My dear friend from Hillsborough posed a number of questions which I think are valid. I would repeat one of them. He asked in what way does our association with NATO and NATO's integrated military structure inhibit those things that the so-called doves would pursue with eagerness and at the expense of Canada making a fair and equitable contribution to the defence of the western world. I fail to see any way. I fail to see any real argument that we should not bear the cost of maintaining a physical presence in Europe. At least I fail to see one that would persuade any individual who has bothered to look into the question.

Indeed, it is my understanding the cost of keeping our troops in Europe is approximately \$20 million. I am perfectly aware that the