

National Defence Act Amendment

great importance to them during the committee deliberations, the article says:

Unfortunately, it is not that simple. Commitments to NATO are not immutable and are, even now, in the process of changing. And there is no clear line to be drawn between forces committed to NATO and those designated for peacekeeping, or restoring peace where limited war has broken out. Finally, there is no agreement among the critics of unification that a unified force would not be useful to NATO.

As Air Chief Marshal Miller said: "I do not think there is any unanimity as to whether a unified force was a good contribution to NATO.

Mr. Churchill: Can the hon. member give us a page reference? On a point of order, the hon. member said he intended to give quotations from the evidence. Will he not give the page reference so that we can follow what he is reading in the evidence and see whether his statements are accurate?

Mr. Andras: I do not think I have time to do the detailed homework for the hon. gentleman.

The air chief marshal was saying he did not think there was any unanimity as to whether a unified force was a good contribution to NATO. Asked if a peace keeping force was compatible with commitment to NATO—

An hon. Member: Who asked that question?

Mr. Andras: Air Chief Marshal Miller replied:

"Yes, exactly. It can be made up from elements of forces we need for NATO... I do not see that unification will add or subtract from our ability in any way in this."

The committee spent a lot of its time arguing about commitments, but the picture never did emerge very clearly. Admiral Landymore, for one, was convinced that unification implied a secret intention by Mr. Hellyer to withdraw from international alliances. Mr. Hellyer insisted that the policy remains exactly as stated in the White Paper of 1964—to maintain existing commitments and, in addition, to build up capability for peace-keeping.

The article says, on this point:

Asked whether Canada had intimated to its allies its intention to vary the commitment of the air division, (in Europe) Mr. Hellyer replied: "The modest reduction that is taking place this year has already been agreed. In so far as the future is concerned, we will have to indicate this to NATO, if my memory serves me correctly, in December of this year... We are not required to reveal our intention or to discuss our future plans and commitments except at that time... I think that during the course of the year, we will have to decide what to do for the following five-year period..."

Considerations of foreign policy, obviously enough, influence Mr. Hellyer's position. While the defence committee was meeting, External

Affairs Minister Paul Martin told the Senate foreign affairs committee that Canada cannot unilaterally withdraw forces from NATO without seriously endangering the stability of the alliance. But Mr. Martin did not rule out a change in the military commitment.

Mr. Harkness: On a point of order. The hon. member who now has the floor is deliberately and flagrantly disobeying your instruction and your ruling. He is continuing to read word for word from this newspaper article during the last two or three minutes, in spite of the fact that you have warned him he was not to do so. I would ask you, Mr. Chairman, to see that your ruling is observed.

Mr. Andras: I should like to continue to make my point as to the contrast between the evidence given by the various witnesses, and if in doing so my remarks coincide very closely with this newspaper article in the *Globe and Mail* of April 3, it is a close coincidence.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Andras: I continue to paraphrase the article.

Mr. Brewin: Is the hon. member reading or not reading excerpts from the article by Mr. Westell in the *Globe and Mail*?

Mr. Andras: I am attempting to paraphrase it, Mr. Chairman, and to use quotations from the deliberations of the committee in establishing the contrast between the evidence given by the various witnesses.

The Secretary of State pointed out that air portable forces stationed in Canada are already committed to the defence of NATO's northern flank in Norway. Since he spoke, another mobile force in Canada has been committed to the NATO southern flank in time of war. It appears clear from all the evidence, but is nowhere officially stated, that the Canadian intention is to allow the R.C.A.F. nuclear attack force to run down until it passes out of existence in the 70's, but to replace it as a contribution to NATO with mobile ground forces carried by new transport aircraft supported by the new CF-5 ground attack naval plane, and backed by naval transport. This would be a unified force committed to NATO. It would also be the peace keeping or peace restoring force able to operate under UN command.

As several witnesses made clear, the double commitment of this force rests on the calculated gamble that Canada will not be asked to undertake peace keeping missions at the same time as it is called upon by NATO for