

that the last election held in Czechoslovakia before what you call the *coup* produced a majority for the communist party which was slightly greater than the majority that Abraham Lincoln won in 1860, and which he then proceeded to enforce by force of arms which produced the biggest war of the century in North America.

These things obviously are going to happen but my point is that NATO was not designed to roll back communist power from Czechoslovakia, nor was it designed to roll back communist power in Hungary, and even in the great days of John Foster Dulles it could not be used for that purpose because it was not designed for that purpose. It was designed to protect the sphere of influence that already existed, surely.

Mr. MacLean: I do not want to go into a personal experience, but I was in Czechoslovakia just before the *coup* and I would not say that what was taking place there by any stretch of the imagination could have been called a free declaration of popular support.

On page 7 there is a statement beginning with the following words:

Certainly such a development would rob Russia of much of the rationale for maintaining the Warsaw Pact system.

This is arguable, of course. It sounds quite plausible, but thinking back a bit, what rationale did Russia have compared to the democratic countries—Britain the United States, France and so on—who, after World War II, promptly dismantled their military machines whereas Russia, on the other hand, kept hers up and maintained it almost at the strength it was during World War II and, in the process, connived at the imposition of communist control in Eastern Europe as well as gobbling up the Baltic states when there was virtually no military power of any sort in the rest of Europe? What were they afraid of?

Professor McNaught: What were the Russians afraid of?

Mr. MacLean: Yes, since NATO is the bugbear as far as they are concerned at the present time.

Professor McNaught: I am not suggesting, sir, that the only possibility of friction between Russia and the West lies in the existence of NATO. You can go back to Catherine the Great and Frederick the Great and, indeed, through the entire history of Russia and the Germanies and find an historical and cumulative fear on the part of Russians that they will be invaded by armies tramping across the Pripet Marshes and all the rest of it. That is a built-in and historical condition.

I am arguing that the existence of NATO at the moment gives an additional diplomatic advantage to the Russians in their maintenance of the Warsaw Pact

which is the principal system which they use to maintain their predominant influence over Eastern Europe. Certainly I would not argue that all causes of friction or fear by Russia of Germany would be removed by the removal of NATO. What I am suggesting is that the removal of NATO will reduce friction and will reduce the diplomatic reasons and justification for the Warsaw Pact.

• 1210

Mr. MacLean: What about the other side of the coin, the fear of European countries of Russia?

Professor McNaught: Of course, they are there but again, as I have said I do not believe, nor have I ever seen it argued, except by the late Senator McCarthy, that NATO is designed to roll back communism in Eastern Europe.

Mr. MacLean: No, I am not suggesting that, but it was created and designed, I would submit, to stop the communistic flood across Europe which started with Czechoslovakia.

Professor McNaught: This clearly is a matter of difference of view and I think I come down on the side of George Kennan, and the revisionist history that has been going on and the review of atomic diplomacy, that in fact—and I hesitate to quote, because it is not attributable, a very highly placed person in recent Canadian diplomatic service—it is arguable whether or not there was a Russian military threat against Western Europe beyond Czechoslovakia at any time.

Mr. MacLean: This is likely true. The communist is in the position where he uses other methods which democratic countries do not usually use to subvert the legally constituted governments of other countries.

I have one further question. On page 10 with regard to military deserters from the United States, are you suggesting that these people are all legitimate immigrants who intend to cast their lot irrevocably with Canada and to remain here for the rest of their lives as Canadian citizens, as was the case with Sir Clifford Sifton's men in the sheepskin coats that you referred to?

Professor McNaught: There are two points there. I might say just very briefly on your point that democratic governments do not normally use methods of subverting foreign governments that are commonly used by the Russians, I doubt very much whether the Russians have an organization that is any more efficient than the CIA.

Second, on the question of deserters, it seems to me that it is traditionally and properly not our job