

*External Affairs*

I should like now to discuss this matter of consultation in its international aspects. I think that in addition to a clear explanation from the minister as to what the policies of the Canadian delegation will be at Geneva, we are also entitled to a clear explanation from the minister and the government as to how, in their view, the international consultation that he referred to as being so necessary, and to which he referred at such length, is going to be achieved.

I am not going to follow him in all the tortuosities of his interpretation and his misgivings, and his subsequent reassurance as to the meaning of a speech made on January 12 by the Secretary of State of the United States. I must say that to me, at any rate, it seemed that his belief that he had received an undertaking that there would be consultations is like a certain form of hypnosis, that is to say it was self-induced. I can see nothing in the various statements of the minister, and the subsequent statement by Secretary Dulles, which would entitle the government, this House of Commons or the nation to believe that it had an ironclad assurance any more after the minister had spoken in Washington on this matter of consultation than before he had spoken.

The minister himself has told us that he took exception to three words in the speech of Mr. Dulles, when Mr. Dulles was outlining what is sometimes called the new concept of defence policy. Those words were "instantly", "means" and "our choosing". Using those words in the full context of the sentence, we find it reads in this way:

The basic decision was to depend primarily upon a great capacity to retaliate, instantly, by means and at places of our choosing.

The Secretary of State for External Affairs told us that in his view, after he had made his statement in Washington, all three of those words had been satisfactorily explained; so that he now felt, he said, very much reassured that American policy did not mean that there would be instant action or reaction on their part without consultation with their allies.

But, Mr. Speaker, if the minister was worried before he went to Washington, I can see no reason for his satisfaction now. The problem of course is, and always has been, one of consultation. Well, what did Mr. Dulles say about this matter of consultation which would justify the minister in that feeling of reassurance which he says he has? The minister did not summarize the effect of Mr. Dulles' subsequent reassuring words. As I recall them, it seems to me that the effect of what Mr. Dulles had subsequently said was something very much like this: Certainly, we

[Mr. Fulton.]

will as a general rule consult you before acting in any international situation, and we will consult you wherever possible.

What other answer could be given? But I think we are entitled to ask: What sort of assurance is this? Here is one of the sentences used by the Secretary of State of the United States as quoted by our own minister at page 3330 of *Hansard*:

In no place did I say we would retaliate instantly, although we might indeed retaliate instantly under conditions that called for that.

Well, that is just the point; what sort of assurance is that? What is the difference after that statement was made from what it was before it was made? In fact, it seems to me that it is pretty fatuous to say that we now have an assurance that there are ways of consultation, and that we have any right to be more reassured now than we were before. I think the fatuity that would there apply is made clear by the minister's own summary, as it is set out at page 3331 of *Hansard*, where he said:

Mr. Speaker, 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.

Well, the whole atomic age and the speed with which things move, as well as the terrible and devastating results of atomic attack obviously make consultation more important than ever before. Then the minister goes on to say:

Any decisions must surely be collective, whenever that can be done, before action has to be taken.

Well, of course they should be collective. But the great question is—and it is the great and unanswered question; and until it is answered I cannot see how we can accept the minister's feeling of reassurance—when can that be done and what means are being worked out to ensure that it will be done? Until we have that answer it seems to me that a statement of that sort—"Any decisions must surely be collective, whenever that can be done, before action has to be taken"—leaves us perhaps even in a more uncertain frame of mind than we were in before.

The next question is: What decisions are meant? Is it decisions as to general objectives, or decisions as to methods of retaliation, or decisions as to circumstances under which any sort of policy or retaliation will be followed; what sort of decisions are meant?

Then the other great question is: When can and when will that be done? What measure of agreement between nations is there