

to depend primarily upon a great capacity to retaliate, instantly, by means and at places of our choosing."

Some weeks afterwards the Vice-President of the United States spoke over the air on March 14 and said more or less the same thing. I quote:

"Rather than let the Communists nibble us to death all over the world in little wars we would rely in the future primarily on our massive mobile retaliatory power which we could use in our discretion against the major source of aggression at times and places that we chose."

From Mr. Dulles' speech, from which I have already quoted, I picked three words which I consider as being of special importance. These words were "instantly" . . . "means" . . . "our choosing". When I spoke to Mr. Dulles in Washington last week about his speech he said that he did not quarrel with my selection of words, as they were indeed key words. But he was of the opinion that I had excluded that most important word. That word was "capacity". Dealing with that point on March 17 at his press conference Mr. Dulles said:

"If you will read my address of January, 12, you will see what I advocated there was a "capacity" to retaliate instantly. In no place did I say we would retaliate instantly, although we might indeed retaliate instantly under conditions that call for that. The essential thing is to have the capacity to retaliate instantly."

I certainly accept the importance of that word, but I would suggest that the word "capacity" means not only military capacity but political capacity and that, as Mr. Dulles pointed out so clearly in his article on Foreign Affairs, includes the necessity of co-operation with other countries, especially in such things as the use of bases.

Mr. Dulles has pointed out, as did President Eisenhower in his address to the United Nations, and this has also been emphasized by the Canadian delegation to the United Nations Assembly, that this aspect of the question, namely collective capacity and facilities, is in fact a safeguard against rash or provocative action, if such safeguard were needed, on the part of any member of the coalition. For action could only be taken by a joint or collective agreement.

There is a second word to which I devoted some attention in my Washington speech, and that was the word "instantly". That word, in connection with the strategy we are discussing, involves no problem, as I see it, if there is a direct attack on your own territory, or indeed possibly on the territory of your neighbour, because then it becomes a question of self-preservation and quick, effective, and instant action is essential and would be taken by any country attacked. No one, I believe, would take exception to that.

But the situation is not always so clear as that, and not always so urgent. Sometimes we have cases of unclear