

activities of one of the great powers in world affairs and we do not disagree with all of the activities of the other great power. But somewhere in a hostile world we have to choose up sides, and perhaps it is only the lesser of two evils, and I am speaking of this idea of becoming the third force in world affairs. I just do not follow your argument that we are going to be effective in any way and I would like you to enlarge on that.

**Professor McNaught:** Sir, let me take those four main points you have made in order. I am particularly sensitive to your charge of bad history, and my argument there is that it seems to me we have gone through—and most of the writing on the history of Canadian relations in world affairs tends to agree with this—a period in which we moved from relatively impotent colonial status and underdevelopment to a period where we made contributions in South Africa and in two world wars of significant military kind and became industrialized. However, we go right through that period to the point at which Melvin Conant, the defence specialist who wrote *The Polar Watch* made the very effective case that once again we are in a position of being quite impotent militarily. As far as the argument of influence on the military balance of NATO is concerned, it seems to me on looking over the evidence of this Committee when Mr. Gellner was here—and I think his information on military matters is very clear and sharp—that he would agree that the influence we have militarily is political influence and not military influence; that we buy influence politically by making a military contribution. However, the essential argument is the comparison with 100 years ago is that in the nuclear age and the missile age and the air age Canada cannot really, without crippling herself economically, make significant military contributions.

● 1140

I will now move from there to your point about the free ride. I think it is tremendously important we make quite clear that we do not believe we are defended by the United States. I for one certainly do not believe it. I feel very nervous indeed when I realize that the diametric range of the Bomarc missile is 400 miles, so it would go 200 miles north and 200 miles south, and 200 miles south of North Bay is at about Rosedale in Toronto, where it might be presumed to intercept an oncoming Russian bomber if indeed the Russians were silly enough to send bombers over at this late date. I do not think we are arguing for a free ride and I for one would argue that we should not only save that billion dollars on defence but add to it and make an honest woman of Canada in the field of external aid. We are very, very far down on the list now and I am not suggesting a free ride; it is quite the reverse. I think we ought to pay our way far more in terms of trying

positively for conciliation and the elimination of those conditions in the third world that lead to frictions and accidental war.

With respect to being neutral on the question of whether Russia is right in a given case and America is right in another case, I do not think that non-alignment implies that kind of intellectual or moral neutrality. I think there is no reason in the world why non-alignment would prevent us from speaking very forcibly against the Russian intervention in Czechoslovakia, nor would it prevent us from speaking very forcibly against the Russian intervention in Viet Nam, and both things should be done and whatever countervailing action we can take should be followed. It seems to me it is military non-alignment that is the point, and this will free us a good deal for initiatives which might cost us more money than we spend now.

Finally, as to your last point, I do not think that we have to choose sides, in other words.

**Mr. Howard (Okanagan Boundary):** Thank you.

**The Chairman:** Mr. Macquarrie?

**Mr. Macquarrie:** I may say that I was delighted by the definiteness of the point of view expressed in Professor McNaught's paper. As a clean living young Canadian I am a little leery about going over to the American Embassy too often or even spending too much time in the East Block!

I wonder if, in the reference in the first part of your paper to our pusillanimous attitude and our fear of offending the United States, in presenting this you gave much thought to the fact that the Canadian government in foreign policy, as in any other policy, must take note of the attitude of its people. Might it not be that for a long time there was a significant body of opinion in Canada which would look with disfavour upon this act of recognition. I discover there is still a body of opinion, and I am inclined to think it is a minority, but there still are people who feel that way. I wonder if you would be prepared to give a decent regard for our point of view in this factor?

● 1145

**Professor McNaught:** That last piece of phraseology tempts me to say that I do not suppose Prince Edward Islanders favour public ownership very much either! However, it seems to me that a decent regard to Canadian public opinion means testing it precisely, and one of my key arguments is that in putting forward the arguments we do in defence of our present foreign policy we are not really testing Canadian public opinion. That is to say, we tell our electorates that we are defended by the American