

Mr. Fairweather: And is it not true that several senior United States senators and other leaders of opinion met as recently as January in Santa Barbara to try to chart a course for American recognition?

Professor McNaught: Yes. I think the pressures from people like Senator Fulbright and the whole range of liberal senators has been very strong to change American policy on this. That being the case, it probably would not be the first time that Canada has moved as a kind of bellwether.

Mr. Fairweather: Would it be a fair analogy to suggest that Canadian initiative in commercial contact with China was in itself welcome in the U.S.?

Professor McNaught: I am not sure how far one would want to go in supporting that argument. It seems to me that the resistance of—and this is very hard to document too, but there is some documentation on it—American branch plants in this country to the development, and particularly the highly initiative development, of sales in Communist countries suggests that up until the present the United States has not been too pleased about extensive commercial relations developing that way.

Mr. Fairweather: In our United States—Canada interparliamentary group I was astounded to find the change in American policy among what might be thought to be almost neutralist, midwestern people who saw that a sale could empty their storage.

Professor McNaught: Yes.

Mr. Fairweather: You mentioned, sir, the freedom of action that non-alignment would give Canada in certain directions. I am not joining issue on this at this time because we have not written our report, but what change would we make, for instance, in the military government of Greece or the imperialism of Portugal in Africa just by withdrawing from NATO? I would like this developed, if you do not mind.

Professor McNaught: Mr. Fairweather, I was not suggesting that Canada could bring about the change of a foreign government. I was resting most of the case upon the desirability of creating a different image of Canada so that she will not be held suspect or hypocritical in the United Nations or elsewhere. It seems to me that our relationship to the non-proliferation treaty might be a good deal more convincing if we abandoned the argument that we were defended by the bomb. The point about even referring to Greece and Portugal is, of course, that some Canadian war material does get through Portuguese channels to help suppress a revolt in Mozambique, and things of that sort. I agree that in practical terms that is not a very significant influence and Portugal can get the weapons somewhere else. However, in terms of the image and

the credibility of Canada being military aligned to Portugal, which is an extremely reactionary military power in Africa, is not a good imagine. It seems to me that in order to defend that military alignment one would have to make a far more convincing case about its absolute necessity for Canada's national interest to be in it.

Mr. Fairweather: You think of us—to use a current advertising cliché—as sort of a worldwide Mr. Clean. This is the Utopian . . .

● 1135

Professor McNaught: I see the thrust of your argument, and heavens knows I am not suggesting that we should further the idea that so many Americans quite properly—many of colleagues and students amongst others—see of terribly self-righteous, prissy Canadians keeping their skirts clean, when in fact they are not. But I am suggesting that the idea of a non-aligned image is not necessarily the idea of moral purity, but that it is in fact a more realistic policy based on a clear recognition of the actual facts of influence and defence and risk that the one of military alignment.

Mr. Fairweather: Mr. Chairman, I would not mind going to the bottom of the list. There are many other people waiting to ask questions.

The Chairman: Thank you, Mr. Fairweather. Mr. Howard?

Mr. Howard (Okanagan-Boundary): Mr. Chairman, I have a personal comment I would like to make. I was interested in your comparison between Canada of 100 years ago and Canada today. I was rather surprised that you would make such sweeping generalizations of a nation 100 years ago. Surely we are a very different nation today than we were at that time. It would also be very risky to suggest that Britain should base her policies on a position that would be the same as her affairs 100 year ago. In so doing you are an advocate of the free ride in world affairs, as far as Canadian politics are concerned. We have been told by other witnesses—and we believe they are responsible witnesses—that Canada does have an important effect on the military balance in NATO in their conventional forces; that our military forces are important to those forces and that over the past 20 years this has had a significant effect on their peacekeeping abilities in Europe. It seems to me that you jump from this position of taking no stand vis-à-vis the two great powers of the world—we are just going to say, "A plague on both your houses"—to the position of our being really effective as a third force. I do not follow your argument. You say that we would be effective but I do not see in what way we could be effective. Certainly Canadians do not agree with all of the