

the first paragraph on page 4 where you say, in the third line:

...But on the essential things of life they hardly differ at all...

Do you think that the foreign policy aims of Canada and the United States, perhaps proportionate to the difference in magnitude of the two powers, are in a sense the same?

Mr. Golden: That is a very difficult question. When I talk about the essential things of life I am really talking about the freedom of the individual living in a democratic society, and so on. I assume that the paramount aims of national policy in both the United States and Canada are peace and tranquility.

These, of course, are the paramount aims of all settled communities. Peace and tranquility do not sound so sensible to a nation which feels that the events of the last hundred or two hundred years have dealt with it harshly and that is why, in my view, it is so easy to get a vote for peace and tranquility in North America and so difficult to get a vote for peace and tranquility in some other parts of the world.

• 1215

But certainly I would accept that basically we desire a peaceful world order and that is the number one foreign policy objective of Canada and that is the number one foreign policy objective of the United States. I think once you move away from that there are undoubtedly differences between us but I do not regard those differences as going to the quality of life or the essential objectives; they go rather to means and there we come right back to what you said, bearing in mind the difference in size and responsibility. You cannot, in my view, push this to one side.

The pre-occupation with "communism" which one finds in the United States and not quite so much in this country is, I think, because the United States sees its responsibilities globally and also because of certain historical reasons, but I really think that in those areas you are talking with countries which have different missions in the world and that is why they do different things.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): Let me stay on this just for a moment. You have indicated that in the United States there is preoccupation or concern with communism, that essentially while Canadians may not share it to the same degree the reason really is because of

magnitude and not because of an essential difference in outlook or in its concept of the danger of communism; we can actually use communism as such because we realize now we are referring to the number of states which within themselves have a different foreign policy view generated out of their own communist ideology.

Mr. Golden: That is right.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): Are you, in fact, just saying it is a question of magnitude and not some fundamental difference in view?

Mr. Golden: I would agree with that.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): Would you say, then, that for a country today one of the essential criteria of national sovereignty is its ability to devise its own foreign policy and also to be ultimately responsible for its own national defence?

Mr. Golden: Yes, but the two really are not the same, unfortunately. Devising a foreign policy is—I was going to say simple, but obviously it is not simple with committees devoting many, many hours to this but it is relatively simple to devise a foreign policy compared with the complexity of making it effective, even what you and I said a minute ago about peace and tranquility.

How do you impose peace and tranquility? Is it going to be a *pax Romana* or a *pax Britannica* and now a *pax Americana*? I guess not—at least, I hope not. The modern world just does not permit that sort of thing. You said, to be responsible for your own defence but who today, what country today, can be responsible for its own defence?

I assume that one of the major considerations motivating the Russian invasion of Czechoslovakia was defence. There were others, I have no doubt, so even the USSR thinks it is not capable of looking after its defence itself without having reference to what goes on around it and that, it seems to me, is where the real difficulties come in. You can have a foreign policy or defence policy but how do you make it effective by yourself?

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): If I may paraphrase your brief and I think what has been the essence of your testimony here today, there is, in fact, a great deal more that we have in common with the United States than we realize and this must be a first consideration in the development of any kind of