

to inquire about their military status and I do not think that we have ever seriously concerned ourselves about a kind of immigrant's pact with God that he will never leave Canada once he comes here.

On the personal level, I can only say that I have a number of draft dodgers and deserters who are both colleagues and graduate students. My own impression is, particularly as I looked over the applications as I did a week or so ago for Canada Council scholarship grants, that draft evaders and draft dodgers are going to turn out to be one of the most invigorating streams of immigration that we have ever had in this country.

Mr. MacLean: Your point of view on this does not surprise me at all, but I think a country surely has a right to assess the purpose of someone coming into the country is to determine whether they are coming as visitors, landed immigrants, or with the purpose of becoming citizens eventually—permanent residents. I will pass now. I have taken up too much time.

The Chairman: Mr. Groos and then Mr. Lewis.

Mr. Groos: Doctor, to put it mildly, I take it you do not place much value on Canada's taking part in mutual defence alliances such as NATO.

Professor McNaught: Yes, sir.

Mr. Groos: Would you agree that a viable defensive alliance is, perhaps, a prerequisite to negotiating a general disarmament, arguing that it is better to negotiate from a position of joint strength rather than divided weakness?

● 1215

Professor McNaught: That is, of course, an argument that is always put forward in defence of the present NATO arrangements and it is one that I might well have added to the argument about containing West Germany: that in fact you cannot negotiate disarmament and security in Western Europe without matching the Warsaw with the NATO arrangements.

My own feeling, I must confess, is that since the Second World War the history of disarmament conferences—the progress towards disarmament, the progress even towards limiting the spread of the nuclear weapon—has been not only nil but retrogressive and has been based on the growth and extension of the military alliance system. My conclusion is that the military alliance system does not lead us very rapidly towards disarmament.

I think when you couple that with what I consider to be the fact of the case that Canada cannot in any

case contribute militarily anything of substance, we have a political responsibility—I will not use the word “moral” if possible—to experiment and to initiate along the other line. You can call it unilateral disarmament if you like. It is a pejorative term—it is not a pejorative term to me, but it will be if it comes up in the press.

I think that Canada, conceding not that she is defended by the United States as many people argued as isolationists in the nineteen-twenties, but conceding that there is not any defence in a military sense should use this as an area of experiment and say: “We do not believe that we are defended. We believe that we are made more vulnerable and more likely to be attacked and we are not going to commit ourselves to any part in the arms race, whether it be by supplying Portugal or the American army in Viet Nam or by even putting Bomarcas at North Bay and La Macaza; that we, in fact, believe the road to serious progress towards disarmament is along the path of creating mutual confidence and the reduction of friction in any way that we can find open to us.”

Mr. Groos: I am not prepared to agree with your assertion that Canada has nothing to offer to NATO by remaining within the Alliance because I think that she has—I will not use the word “morally” either—but let us come a little closer to home and argue the case the other way.

You say that we have nothing to gain by remaining within the Alliance. May I suggest to you that perhaps we have something to lose from the point of view of the security of our people by removing ourselves from the Alliance, or certainly some sort of an alliance with the United States? I noticed yesterday in a paper—and I am speaking personally now—that the United States apparently intends to instal one of what I think are 14 light ABM sites on Bainbridge Island, which happens to be north of Seattle and Tacoma and in the close vicinity of Vancouver and Victoria.

It seems to me that influence on the site of the anti-ballistic missiles is a matter of very practical importance to the people in the Victoria and Vancouver areas and I think it would be a matter of very practical and urgent importance to the people who live pretty well anywhere along the northern United States boundary. I include people who live in Winnipeg, Toronto and Montreal. Does it not necessitate some sort of alliance so that you can at least be talking to one another about these sort of things and discussing the position of these sites?

● 1220

Professor McNaught: I agree that there are areas of risk here and I would place the argument basically on the question of balancing the risks. It seems to