"You are absolutely correct, Senator Smith. The emphasis upon "our" was in terms of the free world or whatever portion of it is operating in counter-distinction to the Soviet world. I was pointing out that if we only respond at places and by means of their choosing then we do not exercise a maximum deterrent power, and that the differences between "their" and "our" was in terms of the free world and its potential enemy."

I think the effect of this exchange of views, this conference, these statements and these clarifications has been that we now have a fairly clear and reassuring idea of what this new strategy and this new planning for defence is. One thing this interpretation does make clear is that diplomacy and consultation, which is part of diplomacy, is under this doctrine not less important but more important than ever before. Any decisions must surely be collective, whenever that can be done, before action has to be taken.

The <u>New York Times</u> in an editorial on March 20, commenting on this aspect of the question concluded as follows:

"In discussing bipartisan foreign policy here at home--"

This is in the United States.

"--the idea of "being let in on the take-off and not the crash landing" is often mentioned. That goes for our allies, and it ought to apply with special emphasis to Canada."

I am sure hon. members will agree with me when I say that we want to be let in at the take-off so that we can do our part to help avoid a crash landing. I think this is especially true in the relations between Canada and the United States where consultation and co-operation is very essential not only in respect of security matters but also in respect of economic matters and every other matter.

We had a very good illustration last week in Washington of the importance and the value of consultation on economic matters when we met in Washington at the first session of the Canada-United States committee on economic affairs.

We in this country have already built up with our friends in the free world valuable habits of consultation and co-operation. We know now that our fundamental interests are identical. There is, of course, a long way still to go. We must, for instance, increasingly apply the realization of interdependence to our economic policies as well as to our defence policies. In respect of consultation for defence, defence planning and all that kind of thing, I suggest that we should try to use the North Atlantic Council more than we have in the past. We have a Permanent Council in session in Paris. It is meeting every few days and I think this council should be an effective vehicle for consultation in this field. Next month, on April 23, we are going to have a ministerial meeting of the North