

Mr. Harkness: All I can say on that is that I disagree completely with you. I think your position in this regard is not borne out by actual experience. It is certainly not by my experience and I have had considerable with regard to these matters. I think the exact reverse is the case. The fact that we do belong to these alliances, the fact that we do maintain a certain degree of armament and make a certain contribution to the security of the western world puts us in a very much better position to have some influence on world affairs and have some influence on the general action which is taken by the alliances we belong to on the whole than would be the case if we withdrew from them.

Professor McNaught: I agree that is the point of difference, sir.

Mr. Harkness: Quite a few of the statements that you make throughout here I think are subject—I will put it in this way. Would you agree that they represent your point of view and that there are a large number of other people who are knowledgeable in these matters who would take the directly opposite point of view?

Professor McNaught: I find that almost certainly and always to be the case, yes.

Mr. Harkness: I will just mention one or two of these. You say:

... as we review our role in the International Control Commission in Vietnam it becomes more and more clear that we accepted the job principally because the United States thought we would be the best representative of the West—that we would be a patsy for the Americans.

This is directly contrary to all my knowledge in regard to this matter which, I would humbly submit, is perhaps a little more intimate than yours from a practical point of view. What evidence have you that that statement is correct?

Professor McNaught: The evidence, it seems to me, is that it was the United States that suggested we should join the Commission. The evidence also is in various places in *Hansard*, where Senator Martin, who was then External Affairs Minister said as he was directly countering the argument that we were neutral on the ICC—no, I believe it was in answer to questions put to him by Mr. Lewis a couple of years ago. He said, "No, we are not. We are there as the western member of the ICC." I take that as fairly substantial evidence that that is what we were.

Mr. Harkness: That is a very different thing, though, than saying that we were there principally because the United States thought we should be and that we are a

patsy for the Americans. Actually when the Commission was set up, as you will probably remember, we accepted the job as the result of a request at the Geneva Conference in regard to the matter, and we accepted, as far as I am aware, not with any idea of representing the United States on it but of representing the western world generally on it. Poland was to represent the eastern world generally on it and India was supposed to be there as a non-alliance member of it. In no sense whatever, to my knowledge, were we to be there representing the United States and particularly to be a patsy for the United States. I take the greatest objection to this statement that we would be a patsy for the Americans.

Professor McNaught: The word perhaps is unduly offensive. If you would like me to change it to "agent" or "representative" or something of that sort, I would be perfectly agreeable. It is there for a little extra point, Mr. Chairman, and I think it is a matter of interpretation.

● 1300

Mr. Harkness: I think my point there would be that we were the representative of the western world.

Professor McNaught: In the same way that Poland was of the eastern world?

Mr. Harkness: On the whole. Poland was there representing the Communist bloc, yes.

Professor McNaught: And who lays down policy for the Communist bloc.

Mr. Harkness: This comes back to the very matter that Mr. Lewis was mentioning, that there is an essential and very great difference between the Communist bloc and the western world.

Professor McNaught: But I would argue in this case, sir, that the essential difference is that where the Communist nations may feel themselves compelled to toe the line, Canada, in all too many cases, has self-imposed upon Canadian policy a support of the American position, and the evidence for that I think is clear and spread right across our foreign policy. I agree it is self-imposed.

The Chairman: That is an advantage, Professor.

Professor McNaught: It is an advantage if you recognize that self-imposition can be revoked.

Mr. Harkness: Also, I think it is a matter of each country in the Western World looking first, as it must do, to what its own best interests are. And our best interests, in my view, are served by continuing in the alliance, in these alliances.