

Professor McNaught: Well, sir, I defer to your superior knowledge of French Canadian feeling on it. I can only draw my conclusions from the historical books I have read and from looking at the contemporary press, I suppose, of French Canada.

I would defend the proposition that the intervention in South Africa, although it did not carry with it conscription, did carry a point of view in supporting the British Colonial Empire in trouble that most French Canadians found very distasteful, and that certainly conscription in two world wars did create a racial crisis in the country.

On the question of whether or not Quebec opinion is more forthright in its support of our present military alignment, it is very hard to test exactly but I would say that if one went through the issues of *Cité Libre* when they were heavily contributed to by the present Prime Minister . . .

Mr. Laniel: Read by no one though.

Professor McNaught: Read by the new guard perhaps—that one would find considerable informed expression of Quebec opinion in favour of nonalignment. I think you would find the same in *Le Devoir*.

Mr. Laniel: There are many people in Quebec, like any other province, that speak to themselves and between themselves only.

Professor McNaught: That I suppose has to be a matter of opinion in the absence of a precise opinion poll. But I would argue that even if your case were so that again, as with English-speaking Canada, the presentation of a case based on what in fact are the facts might well, if it were politically pressed, result in a majority for nonalignment.

Mr. Laniel: Would you not agree, though, that part of the problem that you referred to would be related just as much, if we complied with part of your conclusion, to the economic or sentimental relations with the Empire, from the side of French Canadians, who would look at English-speaking Canadians as sometimes forgetting Canada too much for the benefit of the Empire—and that it was only a matter of feeling and lack of communication? So I do not see exactly what our commitments or alignment have to do with that. But now it is being changed and our alignment is more with the United States. Still I am not sure that the Canadian population does come to the same conclusion that you do. Can you really give me an alternative to Canada's progress in the future, or can you tell me really if Canada would have progressed just as much as it has without being aligned.

Professor McNaught: Well this, of course, is the very centre of the argument and it is why I was suggesting that a review of foreign policy, particularly with respect to military alignment, has to be also a review of the whole range of domestic economic social policy. I am very impressed by the findings of the Watkins Report and Mr. Safarian's writing on the extent of the American ownership of Canadian industry. I am also very impressed with the way a country like Sweden can produce for itself all the military equipment it needs and that anything that it has to buy in the way of particular electronic equipment it can buy without putting all its eggs in one country's basket.

It seems to me that what we have done in fact is to allow the economic military relationship to become so intertwined that it is now possible for a man like Professor Underhill to say that in 1940 we moved out of our British century and into our American century and will inevitably have to follow the American lead. It is that kind of interpretation I am trying to contest. I, for one, do not see the inevitability that is attached to it. I, for one, think that a serious commitment to economic planning in this country could render us less dependent that Mr. Pearson suggested in his letter upon defence production-sharing agreements, and I suspect that if the political campaign were put in the right hue that Canadians would support that line of progress.

Mr. Laniel: I do come to the conclusion that your opinions or conclusions are based more on morality than anything else because we hear people, and I believe it, say that nuclear war is impossible and that the danger of war is among unstable nations. You might have different opinions than I have or get a different image, but I believe that the dangers of war exist in small emerging nations, and very often in nations that have instability and a racial crisis—and they are nonaligned countries. So how can you come to a conclusion like that.

Professor McNaught: I do not really see the relationship there. I think that certainly Canada's influence should be toward minimizing the crises and the imbalance and the insecurity of those small nonaligned and underdeveloped countries—although they are not all nonaligned. Pakistan, for example, is aligned. But the fact that they are nonaligned is not the fact which makes them unstable, nor is the fact that we are aligned make us unstable. All I am suggesting is that we can free ourselves to work in precisely those unstable areas more effectively if we accept the argument about the indefensibility of our national interests in the event of a nuclear war. I do not think any of your witnesses probably have suggested that Canada is likely to face a conventional attack.

Mr. Laniel: I will not pursue that line of questioning, Mr. Chairman.