

some machinery, that is effective and in which the public will have very great confidence that they will not be lost in the rush. Is there any hope of that?

Hon. Mr. PEARSON: I think we ought to distinguish in our mind between consultation itself in these matters, which is desirable—indeed it is essential—and any central agency for continuous global consultation on the high political level which may not be so easy. Mr. Graydon will recall that even during the height of the war we had not such central agency for political consultation. Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill met when it seemed desirable to meet; they met quite often, but there was no continuing agency for consultation.

There was also the combined chiefs of staff for military consultation, with which other countries were associated now, while it may be difficult to work out that kind of central political consultative agency, the fact is that consultation is going on all the time also in the case of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization we have an agency for consultation. We have, also as Mr. Graydon pointed out, the Korean consultative committee in Washington, if you care to call it that. But apart from these, I do not know of any major political development that has occurred or that has been contemplated in the last two or three years where we have not in some way been informed or consulted.

After all, we have our ordinary channels of diplomacy and that is what they are for. I do not, for instance, have to rely only on this weekly committee in Washington to find out what is likely to happen in Korea. We have our Canadian Ambassador in touch with the State Department every day. We have an understanding with other governments, such as the United States, that they will tell us when they are going to initiate major policies. Occasionally they forget to do so, but they are human and so are we. But there is a daily process of consultation.

Similarly from our European missions we knew within a matter of hours what Mr. Dulles was talking about on his recent visits to Paris, Bonn, and London. We did not have to apply to any central agency. Mr. Davis for instance is a pretty active person at Bonn and he found out what was said there and the reports were on my desk almost within twenty-four hours; and the same is true in respect of our heads of mission in Paris and London. And when Mr. Dulles got back to Washington, our Ambassador got in touch with them and I received a pretty good report of what they had talked about, from the United States point of view. So, within the group of free countries, we have pretty effective consultation.

Mr. GRAYDON: I am interested in what he says because that would seem to indicate that the situation is in better shape than the public would be led to believe was the case at times. Might I ask one thing. Does the minister feel that the present system of consultation cannot be improved upon particularly, or that it is satisfactory as it stands?

Hon. Mr. PEARSON: There is nothing that cannot be improved. Certainly this can be improved, and as I have said, there are times when the existing agencies of consultation do not function as effectively as they could. Very often the government which is bearing the greatest part of the burden, the United States government, feels that it must act very quickly and I would hate to think that they could not act quickly in an emergency without first obtaining the agreement of a dozen or so other countries. I would hate to think also that they would not wish to consult us before they took any important action.

Once in a while we all slip up. We actually do things in Canada, I suppose, about which we should tell others, but sometimes forget to do so.

Mr. CROLL: I think the feeling of Canadians is somewhat different from what Mr. Graydon has suggested. I think we feel that we have been consulted out of all proportion to our importance; and from what I read about what goes on in other countries, I am of the opinion that nothing happens which in any