

take the bomb while we glory, apparently and officially, under its protection.

I think then that there is a real credibility gap between the generally conceded knowledge that there is no defence in a nuclear war, and our admitted dependence upon the military alliance based upon the dominant nuclear power.

I argue that there is an historical background for essentially a militarily non-aligned policy in Canada, and it comes from the readings of most of the militia bills of the early years following Confederation, when, in fact—and perhaps I can put this most briefly by reading it—we believed:

that the only danger of attack lay in a breakdown of relations between Britain and the United States—and that the chief burden of defence would therefore be upon Britain. The main difference a hundred years later is that our protector . . .

the United States, not Britain

. . . could not protect us.

I think we could argue that if Macdonald and Cartier had believed that Britain could not protect us, we would have had Dominion status a lot sooner than we did.

But the real point I think is that we should revoke a policy of military alignment because it is defended largely on a myth. And I think it is a core part of my argument—and I go perhaps beyond where some of the other witnesses have gone, who may have vaguely supported this point of view—that we should not argue that withdrawal from the military alliance system results from our belief that the United States has to defend us. It seems to me that that is a credibility gap in some of the arguments.

We should say plainly, if we are to have a realistic and honest policy based on what we know to be the case, that there is no defence. There is only the appalling danger that civilization will be annihilated if all states do not recognize what in fact will happen if nuclear war breaks out.

In other words, I think we ought to use a position of military non-alignment quite consciously as an international image. It should not be an image of aloof Swedish or Swiss neutralism, but an image of genuine concern which reflects, I think, the real beliefs of the Canadian people rather than the tired outdated shibboleths of power.

● 1115

I think you can again sustain the argument for non-alignment by an historical reference. When we

were being pressed by London in the fourth quarter of the nineteenth century to join a *kreigsverein* of the British Empire, our argument usually was that the biggest contribution Canada could make to the defence of the Empire, was to make Canada safe and to build Canada up economically. And occasionally someone like Sir Charles Tupper would argue that this building of the CPR was, in fact, a contribution to the military strength of the Empire. But no Canadians really believed that, and certainly no Englishman did.

On one occasion Captain Mahan of the United States, who was to that period of 1890 much like Henry Kissinger is to the 1960s—I would argue a founder of American imperialism—suggested that the completion of the CPR under British aegis in Canada was a dagger pointed at the heart of American military power. But I do not think that many Americans or Canadians really believed that.

In other words, we were non-aligned militarily even while we were members of the Empire, and it was not until we quite unnecessarily aligned ourselves militarily in the South African war that we got into serious racial trouble, and that crisis deepens steadily.

I think there is a real lesson to be learned, and I would put it this way. In periods when the military expenditures which we can afford are insufficient to affect in any significant way the international balance of power, we are best advised to put all our effort into proving that a multi-racial state in the modern world can survive without atomizing itself and can develop a cultural life as rich, or richer, than that which can be afforded by nations which devote preposterous proportions of their national income to doomsday weapons.

Professor Eayrs, and I will not go over his argument, has already proven to my satisfaction, and I do not know to how many members of the Committee that would be equally true, that we could pare about a billion dollars from the present defence budget and still have ready a sufficient para-military force to be used at the service of the U.N. if and when it was needed. These savings, it seems to me, could well be spent on the alleviation of poverty and the enrichment of culture in Canada, and on extensions of our foreign aid program which is now, as Mr. Gellner pointed out earlier, abysmally low amongst the developed nations of the world. It seems to me that it would take a very powerful argument indeed to say that we would not do more for the peace of the world and for even a narrowly conceived Canadian national interest by spending that billion dollars in that way rather than on weaponry and personnel which virtually everybody agrees does not basically affect the power of the alliance structure.