

We have already given that assurance, but if it will make my hon. friends feel any better I am quite happy to repeat unequivocally that assurance tonight in this House. If we fail, and we might fail, then I suggest that our policy be this: when possible, to limit conflicts, to prevent them spreading, and then to add them. There is no other policy in the mind of any member of this government.

This debate has done something else which has caused a good many of us--I know that it has caused me--some anxiety. In certain sections of the House--and I am referring now to the members of the C.C.F. party--it has underlined a very deep uneasiness which they in particular feel about United States policy. That anxiety--and "anxiety" is certainly not too strong a word in view of some of the expressions that have been used in this debate. --was expressed both by the leader of the C.C.F. party and by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). In my view these hon. members, for whom as they know, I have great respect, and others in their group who spoke, presented an unfair and unbalanced picture of the situation, especially in respect of the United States attitudes and policy towards Asia. I am now talking about the situation in the Far East. I was especially disappointed, and indeed distressed, by the analysis which was made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, not so much of the policy, but of the purpose of the policy of the Secretary of State of the United States. On page 2878 of Hansard he said this:

"I think it is Mr. Dulles' primary purpose to keep war away from the United States."

A few words later, he says:

"If he can keep war away from the United States --if he can keep it in the Pescadores, in Quemoy, in Matsu or in northern Canada--his aim is met. His aim is to keep war away from continental United States."

We may have differences of opinion with Mr. Dulles on matters of policy. I have had them myself, and no doubt will continue to have them. We may have one view or the other about the wisdom of his policy, but I think that it is most unfair to suggest that the Secretary of State of the United States, who is serving in the government of President Eisenhower, has any other purpose than that which we have in this House, to keep war away and not merely away from the continental United States. I would not like that kind of statement to go on the record of this House without the kind of challenge that I am giving it now.

The hon. member also said--and this sentiment was echoed by other members of his group--that our foreign policy should be made in Ottawa only and not in Washington. Well as long as Canada is a sovereign state, the decision in foreign policy and any other policies have to be made in this Parliament of Canada. That is a very different thing from saying that our policy can only be made in Ottawa and should not be made or even influenced anywhere else. Foreign policy in this world of interdependence cannot be made in any one country or any one capital no matter how powerful that country or capital