

Mr. Cafik: Is not NORAD primarily an organization to prevent anyone launching a successful attack against the United States?

Mr. Golden: My understanding is that these are all designed to convince a would-be aggressor that it is not going to be worthwhile trying it, and, consequently, it is all just as defensive—one or the other. If the unthinkable occurs then, of course, you have got to carry on. But the concept in my view is exactly the same in both NATO and NORAD.

Mr. Cafik: Can we make as significant a contribution to NORAD as we can to NATO?

Mr. Golden: In my view we can make a significant contribution anywhere providing we are prepared to devote the necessary resources. I have gone on the assumption, which might be totally wrong, that we are looking at defence budgets somewhere of the order of magnitude of what we have now. If that assumption is wrong, then I would like to make another appearance before the Committee.

Mr. Cafik: You do not feel that the defence budget should be increased or decreased but that it should mainly stay as it is?

Mr. Golden: I am not making any observations about whether it should or should not. I am trying to give my best judgment, in analyzing these policies, of what I think will be.

Mr. Cafik: You feel that we should cut back our military participation in NATO?

Mr. Golden: I believe that in concert with our allies, not abruptly, not unilaterally, and spread over four or five years, if the defence budget is going to remain in the same ballpark as it is now, we should reduce our military contribution to NATO substantially.

Mr. Cafik: But you feel that we should still maintain our alliance with NATO?

Mr. Golden: Indeed I do.

Mr. Cafik: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman: Mr. Laniel, and then Mr. MacDonald.

Mr. Laniel: Mr. Golden, many of my questions have been asked but perhaps I could ask you for a personal opinion. You must

have been travelling as Deputy Minister of Defence Production. Do you think that any country in the world would consider Canada as a non-aligned country because of our geographic situation even if we did withdraw from NATO and NORAD?

• 1205

Mr. Golden: I do not think there is the slightest chance that anybody would think that Canada is non-aligned. I certainly do not think so myself.

Mr. Laniel: This means that in your mind, relative to the promotion of peace and participation with the United Nations in peace-keeping forces, or other objectives of that kind, our image would not be changed in any way whether or not we did withdraw from these alliances?

Mr. Golden: No, I do not.

The Chairman: May I ask a supplementary?

Mr. Laniel: Yes.

The Chairman: Do you regard Mexico as a non-aligned country, Mr. Golden?

Mr. Golden: Yes.

The Chairman: May I just ask why you feel that if we withdrew from NATO and NORAD we could not be considered as non-aligned whereas Mexico to the south is in your view, a non-aligned country?

Mr. Golden: Because I think we are very active in many of these areas and we will continue to be active, whereas Mexico is not, and has not been. These situations can change very radically and I might be wrong about Mexico, but that is the way I look at it.

Mr. Laniel: I have come to the same conclusion. Therefore, if we are to look at our defence policy and participation in our alliances I think we should bear in mind the very important economic factor. Our defence-sharing program is mainly with the United States. What proportion of all our sharing programs with all of our allies would be directly related to the United States in comparison to other NATO countries?

Mr. Golden: Because of geography and because of the very close relationship between Canadian and American industry, not in this field, but in general, the over-