

*External Affairs*

service which he has rendered by inducing Mr. Dulles, the Secretary of State of the United States, to clarify that momentous statement he made on January 12.

I was greatly surprised to hear the hon. member for Kamloops (Mr. Fulton) assert in this house tonight that the speech made by our Secretary of State for External Affairs to the national press club in Washington and the statement that followed it by Mr. Dulles in his article in *Foreign Affairs* has shed no light on the original statement by Mr. Dulles. I certainly cannot agree with that estimate. That statement of January 12 by the United States Secretary of State I have described as momentous. I think it was momentous for several reasons. First, it gave a clear and unequivocal warning to potential aggressors; second, it seemed at first sight at any rate, to place great emphasis upon the utilization by the western powers of those resources in which they have the greatest advantage such as, for instance, their scientific supremacy, their technical know-how, their industrial skill; all of which may be regarded as offsetting the vast, almost unlimited manpower of the Soviet bloc. But nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, that statement inspired serious misgivings.

What were some of the causes of the uneasiness produced by the Dulles new look statement. First of all, of course,—as the Secretary of State for External Affairs clearly showed in his speech on Thursday in this house—there was the question as to whether there would be prior consultation between the United States and its allies before resort was had to this policy of instant and massive retaliation. Fears were expressed in many quarters that the United States might be lapsing into a policy of continentalism.

I have before me here extracts from Mr. Dulles' article in the April issue of *Foreign Affairs*, an article which followed the speech by our Secretary of State for External Affairs in Washington. I quote from Mr. Dulles' statement as follows:

The cornerstone of security for the free nations must be a collective system of defence. They clearly cannot achieve security separately. No single nation can develop for itself defensive power of adequate scope and flexibility. In seeking to do so, each would become a garrison state and none would achieve security.

And Mr. Dulles went on to say this:

This is true of the United States. Without the co-operation of allies, we would not even be in a position to retaliate massively against the war industries of an attacking nation.

Then he added a reference to the use of bases of the United States in foreign countries:

The free world system of bases is an integral part of its collective security. At the recent four-power conference in Berlin, Mr. Molotov repeatedly attacked these bases as evidence of aggressive purpose. Actually these bases on the territory of other sovereign countries are merely a physical expression of the collective security system.

Then he went on to say this:

They were constructed only at the request of the host nation and their availability depends upon its consent, usually as a legal condition and always as a practical one. The requisite consent to the use of these bases would never be accorded unless it was clear that their use was in response to open aggression, and reasonably related to its scope and nature. This gives assurance of their community function.

What Mr. Dulles said in his article in *Foreign Affairs* he restated, perhaps even more emphatically, in a press conference which he held in Washington on March 16. I quote from the report of that conference as it appeared in the *New York Times* of March 17. This is Mr. Dulles answering a question, and he said:

It is, I think, well known that the bases which we have in foreign countries are in general not usable as a matter of law, and as a practical matter are not usable except with the consent of the countries where the bases are. For example, the bases which are available to our strategic air force in Great Britain are not usable as a base of attack except with the consent of the British government. The same is true in general with all our foreign bases. Therefore, it is implicit in our security system that it operates with the consent and acquiescence of the other partners who have helped to provide the facilities which create a sort of international police system.

Later in that same press conference when asked if there would be consultation Mr. Dulles said:

Yes, there would certainly be consultation in most of the cases that I can conceive of.

Now, Mr. Speaker, admittedly Mr. Dulles' statement does not say that there will be consultation in every conceivable case, but it does say that there will be consultation in most cases and that there could not be use made of United States bases in other countries without the consent of the host country. That, I think, is important for us to know in Canada, particularly for those of us who live in parts of Canada where the United States has military bases as, for example, in Newfoundland.

Another question which the new look statement of Mr. Dulles on January 12 raised in the minds of many people is this: Would the apparent reliance upon massive retaliatory action necessarily mean a general war? Would it mean that whenever aggression of any kind, even of a small kind, took place in any