

may be. We are working together today in a peace coalition, and the very essence of that coalition is that every member of it acts only after discussion and consultation with others. In that sense each member must influence the other members' policy, and I hope it will remain that way, because that is the way it should be. That gives our best chance for peace, by collective policy and collective action. In this respect I am distinguishing between decision and the formulation of policy. Suppose the United States adopted that maxim and made its own policy solely in Washington, or the United Kingdom decided to make its policy solely in London, or the French Government solely in Paris; it would not be long before the North Atlantic Treaty Organization would itself dissolve. If it dissolved we would not be worrying so much about whether we were making our own policy; we would be worrying far more about our protection against potential enemies even than we do now.

Foreign policy in a coalition working for peace is bound to operate collectively if it is to succeed. That does not mean that we are merely tagging along behind American decision. It may be that my hon. friend from Winnipeg North Centre and some of his colleagues think so. He himself said, as reported on page 2877 of Hansard:

"We feel the result is that Canada has said--"

This refers to my statement in Toronto.

"--that we regard ourselves as quite free to make any decisions we want with regard to foreign policy, so long as they are agreed to by Washington."

Well, with all respect, that is a distorted and unfair interpretation of what I said in Toronto or what I have said in this house, and I only need mention one example to prove how unfair it is. Has Washington agreed to our statement of policy that we will not intervene in Matsu or Quemoy if they are attacked by the forces of communist China? We have made that statement and I am happy to repeat it tonight, but it was not made, nor was the policy decided, after any agreement in Washington; on the contrary. That statement then was unfounded.

Another statement from the same group was made to the effect that apparently I feel now that I have to go along very easily and readily with the views of the Secretary of State of the United States. I hope that Mr. Dulles' views will be such that I can go along with them easily and readily, but I can assure you sir, if any assurance is needed, that I will not hesitate to disagree with them when I feel that it is undesirable and unwise to support them. It seems to me that the trouble with my hon. friends in the C.C.F. party in these matters is that they take a jaundiced and morbidly suspicious view of everything that goes on in the United States, or at least in the United States official circles. As was pointed out this afternoon in what I thought was a very effective intervention by the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Philpott), sometimes they mistake the clamour and confusion of voices in that vigorous, free democracy for the authentic expression of United States policy. I suggest, therefore, that occasionally they look a little more closely behind the headlines. I