

That, then is the meaning of the proposition I have advanced, of the inevitability of close, co-operative arrangements with the United States in maintaining the peace and in joint defence against a major attack. This means, as the United Nations and NATO meant, that our right to be neutral has been limited by our desire to strengthen the security of our country and protect the peace. It does not mean, although I have heard it mis-stated in these terms that whenever the United States is engaged in any kind of war, we are at war.

Only the other day I was reading an editorial in a Canadian paper which analysed very correctly what I was trying to say in Toronto the other day. After reading that editorial I went on to read a news story about the same subject and over that news story in large red type were these words: "U.S. Wars are ours". Nothing I have said today, or nothing I have said before means that.

It certainly does not mean that we must participate in limited or peripheral wars, although because of the danger of such wars spreading it gives us the right and the duty to express our concern, not only in Washington but also in London or in the United Nations or in NATO, over situations or policies that might lead to conflict. It also makes it imperative on all of us to prevent local conflicts, not only because they are war - war is war whether local or general - but also because they can spread and cover the world. In that case there would be no future for any of us, because a war that covered the world would be a nuclear war.

This view that we could not be neutral in a major war when the very existence of the people of the United States was at stake, far from representing an abdication of responsibility for our foreign policy, extends and deepens that responsibility. It underlines our right and our obligation to concern ourselves with and make our views known on the policies of others, especially of the United States, when questions of peace and war are involved. Its possession of the greatest power in the world gives us, I think, the right to be especially pre-occupied with the policies of the United States. It makes consultation and a continuous exchange of views imperative. It emphasizes our obligation to do everything possible to avoid every kind of war, big or little.

That is one reason why we were so glad to welcome to Ottawa in recent days the Secretary of State of the United States, and to discuss with him very frankly and very fully United States policy and our own policy on these matters. It has been argued - I commend this to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) - that if the Americans know we accept the proposition that in the circumstances I have mentioned Canada and the United States must stand together, Washington will no longer pay much if any attention to anything we say; they will, if I may use a colloquialism, feel that they have us in the bag. Of course the exact contrary is the case, as is shown by the reply Mr. Dulles made to a question asked at his press conference in this city last Friday. I should like to put this question and answer on the record, and I quote: