

*External Affairs*

On March 19 this interpretation was made even clearer when Mr. Dulles appeared before the Senate foreign relations committee and was asked this question by Senator Smith of New Jersey:

As a result of your January 12 speech, that is when you first spoke of this capacity to retaliate, there have been fears expressed that the United States would not consult our allies in the event of an attack . . . These fears are based on the words in your speech "by means and at places of our choosing". Now I interpreted that when I read it to mean that you were referring to our choosing rather than to the enemies choosing. You would not say our choosing exclusive of our allies? I am correct in my interpretation?

Mr. Dulles replied in words which were very clear and to the point:

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.

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

The *New York Times* 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 are 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 Atlantic council. The only subject on the agenda of that meeting is exchange of views on the international situation between the foreign ministers of the North Atlantic countries, all of whom will be there and all of whom will be discussing the subject that I am discussing now. That is the kind of subject that should, I think, be discussed at the North Atlantic council not only at occasional meetings of ministers but continually through the permanent representatives so that in that agency of consultation we can clear our views on defence and foreign policy.

We must also constantly seek not only to preserve but to widen and develop still further our attitudes and habits of confidence, frank discussion and consultation, restraint and tolerance. Notwithstanding the importance of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization which I have just emphasized, this must be done on a scale which is not limited to the North Atlantic alliance but which is as broad as the globe. Indeed, our co-operation, our friendships must extend beyond our western civilization. Improving the economic and social conditions under which the major part of humanity lives will not ensure peace but it will make peace more likely. More important possibly than even economic aid is the opportunity for understanding and for genuine friendliness between the peoples of Asia in their hundreds of millions and those of the western world. These Asians will form their impressions of our civilization and values above all by what they learn and sense of our real attitudes. That is only one reason, I think, why all members of the house have been so happy