

have the means of keeping them off would be a very expensive undertaking indeed.

Mr. Cafik: This brings up the next question. You talk about the "free ride" concept. I am rather inclined to think that Professor McNaught who was our last witness had this in mind. In any event, you speak of public opinion, you think the public would reject this idea of a free ride. Professor McNaught rather thought that perhaps the public had been misled in its views; that we had begged the question—the government talks about the necessity of NATO and for a number of years we were constantly involved in justifying NORAD—and that we had, in effect, created a condition where the public may have a misinformed judgment. He rather felt that if he had a chance to put forward his propaganda everybody would believe precisely the opposite.

Mr. Golden: I did not realize that Ken McNaught had had any trouble with his propaganda. I tried to come to the hearings to hear Professor McNaught, but you were in a very small room and I could not get in. I read his paper but I did not hear the questioning. I really cannot comment on that.

I am not expert on what 21 million Canadians think or feel. I tried to be honest with the Committee. It is just wrong for Canada to say that we do not have to do something because the United States will do it for us. I just do not think this is the way in which one builds a nation, but other people may have different views and I respect them for it. As far as other aspects of the free ride are concerned, of course, it will not get you very far. As I tried to point out in the first paragraph, you are not only going to get a free ride, you may be taken for a ride.

Mr. Brewin: May I ask a supplementary? I agree with your concept of the free ride, but is it not possible to say that because you are freely getting your main territorial defence supplied by American forces, this releases you to do entirely different things. This does not mean that you do nothing; it means, however, that your role is changed by reason of the existence of the geographical fact that you are part of the North American continent; you are within the American zone of defence whether you do anything or not. Does this not change your role? I think even Professor McNaught would be more in favour of that proposition than a free ride, saying Canadians should do nothing as a result of this.

• 1200

Mr. Golden: I agree with that. Of course, it is also true we sometimes forget that we always contemplate allowances, because we have very distorted forces. Looking at the Canadian forces in isolation they make absolute nonsense unless you contemplate that we will be in alliance, and pre-eminently in alliance, with the United States of America.

Mr. Cafik: I have one other line of questioning. I have the impression—I may be wrong—that your primary view is that we should align ourselves very strongly with the United States through NORAD and that our involvement in NATO is of lesser significance. Is that a fair statement of your position?

Mr. Golden: That is a fair statement, except that I believe that NORAD is really contributing to NATO and can properly be considered a part of NATO. But with that amendment, I do not quarrel with what you say.

Mr. Cafik: It has been maintained by many, and I think it is a generally accepted view, that there is no defence in the event of nuclear war. By that I mean, no defence sufficiently adequate to ensure that the lives and property of our people would be safeguarded. Would you take the same view?

Mr. Golden: I would not say "no defence", but that it would not be very effective.

Mr. Cafik: All right. That leads me to this question: The argument put forward in favour of our involvement in NATO directly in Europe is that it is primarily a role to prevent the occurrence of war and that perhaps NORAD is primarily a defence against the event of war.

Mr. Golden: I would not agree with that at all. I would think that is not accurate at all. The main purpose of NORAD is also to provide credibility so that people do not start a war. Once it is started you try to do certain things about it. But they are all designed to avoid this war, and I would not draw any distinction at all. I really find that line of thought very difficult to accept.

Mr. Cafik: Do you consider all the nuclear deterrent resident in the United States—its ballistic missiles and submarines, and so on—all part of NORAD?

Mr. Golden: It is not part of NORAD necessarily, but NORAD is part of it, in the sense that this is what NORAD is all about.