

indicate that I do not believe on a major matter of security the United States could consider of no consequence what action Canada might take.

I go on to say I do not suggest for a minute that we are about to be overrun and occupied every time we tell the United States they cannot do something. My whole experience, of course, has been the other way, limited though it is. In most matters of dispute the United States has been very reasonable about considering Canadian points of view. I was never charged with any policy responsibility, but executing some of these policies can also become difficult sometimes.

All I am really saying here is that it is not the same when you are a modest power as it is when you exercise very, very onerous world responsibilities.

Mr. Cafik: If they are very reasonable in their relations with Canada, is that because Canada normally accedes to their wishes? How reasonable would they be if we were not quite so co-operative? I know experience indicates that they have been reasonable, but they have had no reason to be unreasonable.

Mr. Golden: I hoped I was careful to say, "in my experience". It may be that there are some people here who have always had to negotiate with them in other matters where they were always unreasonable. The gamut of Canadian-American relations is very wide indeed, and I was not trying to cover the entire gamut of U.S.-Canadian relations.

The Chairman: Mr. Cafik, may I ask a supplementary?

Mr. Cafik: Yes, by all means, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman: At that point, Mr. Golden, you indicate there are an infinite number of possible actions that could be taken by the United States. Were you referring to the possibility of economic pressure among other causes of action?

Mr. Golden: Yes, but even before you get to economic pressure it is my understanding that there are subsisting today a number of very special relations between Canada and the United States which are based upon the concept of a commonality of interest in defence measures. In my view that is one step before you get to pressure.

It seems to me it would be quite appropriate for the United States to say, "There are certain agreements that we have: there are

certain understandings that we have which are based on the idea that we do have a common interest in defence. If we do not have that common interest, is it right that Canada should have that special relationship?" I suppose that is not the same as economic pressure, which I would think is: "You behave or else the United States has certain things it can do". I am no better equipped than anybody else to say at what stage this might or might not take place or whether it would.

I think we have to bear in mind this is just elementary, but sometimes we tend to forget that not only does Canada have an interest in good Canadian-U.S. relations, but the United States has a very keen interest in this as well. When I am asked about the Canada-U.S. production sharing arrangement, I sometimes have to remind people this was entered into by the United States freely and willingly because it had advantages to them as well. This is not something that smart Canadian negotiators slipped over on the Americans who did not understand what was happening. There is a commonality of interest in all things.

• 1155

Mr. Cafik: In your arguments in respect of national sovereignty you say if we are not going to go through a common effort then we would need forces to do the job ourselves. Further, immediately following, you indicate that if we adopted a neutral or, I presume, a non-aligned stance we would also have to have a defence force to secure that type of establishment. Have you any idea what the cost to the government would be for these two alternatives? Would it cost us less money than our present budget of \$1.8 billion for defence, or would it cost more?

Mr. Golden: I think a lot would depend on how far you want to go, but certainly a Canada capable of keeping the United States and Russia out of its air-space would certainly require, in my view, a budget vastly greater than \$1.8 billion. A Canada prepared to investigate every unknown blip on the radar screen with Canadian aircraft, Canadian warning and control and communications, and so on—I am not enough of an expert to know but there again I should think the costs are likely to be very great. There is not only air; there is sea—air, land and sea forces. I would say that an effective neutrality where we tell everybody to stay off and where we