

armaments a reluctance to face a conflict in Europe which, by the very nature of the Continent and its population, could not be contained, whereas the peripheral wars more easily can be contained.

Mr. Cafik: I do not think I agree with your view but I will pursue another line of questioning. Also on page 4 you say:

but an image of concern which reflects the real beliefs of the Canadian people . . .

I gather you have the impression—and this was pursued a little earlier—that the Canadian public are inclined to favour a non-alignment policy. You had stated that one time, and I find later you give arguments as to why they do not really favour it—because we have not given them the facts, as you call them. I do not know how you can have your cake and eat it; that they are in favour of it but we are misleading them and that is why they are not.

Professor McNaught: Historians are notable for having their cake and eating it, I am afraid, and I will agree with you that I am assuming a knowledge about what the Canadian people want there that is not historically verifiable. That is true. It is my assumption, however, that if the case were put on the kind of ground that I consider to be realistic, then one would have a majority of the Canadian public opinion behind it.

Mr. Cafik: It seems to me that in that argument that you put forward, what you would consider the facts would really be begging the question. In other words, you would expect to say to a group of people—Canadians: “NATO serves no useful purpose; I want you to believe this. I want you to believe that it does not help defend us, it does not in any way deter us from entering into a war; therefore what do you think about it?” I think they are obviously going to vote a particular way if they believe the premise you laid down. So I think you would have the same problem if you presented all your facts to the Canadian people as you see them; I think that they would have the same reason to suspect that they may not have made a valid judgment because the factors may not be right as they were presented to them.

Professor McNaught: I agree it is a political problem at that point, and I am assuming that in presenting the case—and you are hearing all kinds of cases presented to this Committee—just as with Mr. Gellner or General Foulkes, who may wish to substantiate and bolster the present line of policy, it is open to us to try to change it.

Mr. Cafik: Right. On page 5 you say here—and I have always been disturbed about this. We have heard people indicating the same thing.

Professor Eayrs has already demonstrated to this committee that a billion dollars could be pared from our defence budget . . .

I have been a member of this Committee since the 28th Parliament began and I have never really seen any proof that there would be any paring of a billion dollars. I gather that our defence budget is roughly \$1.7 billion and I suppose that it could be argued that we could pare the whole \$1.7 billion. I mean it is quite simple to cut everything off. But I have not seen any evidence that you can pare down that much if you believe that we need any kind of defence at all. And that brings up the next question. Do you feel that we would need any defence if we took a neutral role as you outline, or a non-aligned role?

Professor McNaught: The argument, as I recall it from reading sections of the brief presented by Professor Eayrs and also the chapter in his book on contemporary Canada, which is a very good and recommendable chapter, is that \$700 million would be enough to maintain the kind of paramilitary security forces that we would need. Yes.

Mr. Cafik: And you think that these military forces would be strictly on this continent, in Canada, to defend our coast lines and our northern frontiers?

Professor McNaught: And to some extent, available no doubt as very highly trained technical people to specialized UN essentially police missions.

Mr. Cafik: You must feel, then, that Sweden and Switzerland, which are not aligned, spend too much on defence, do you?

Professor McNaught: I would argue essentially yes.

Mr. Cafik: They do?

Professor McNaught: Yes.

Mr. Cafik: You feel, in other words, that we should just pray and hope that all our neighbours, the Americans, the aggressors and this sort of thing will just sort of sit back and leave us alone. You just hope that everything will go well.

• 1250

Professor McNaught: We only have one neighbour unless one takes the polar projection. . .

Mr. Cafik: That is the area apparently in which there is the greatest danger. In the northern section, I understand from evidence we have heard, there is perhaps real reason why we should have sufficient