

That is why any small committee, set up to find a solution to the current dues-payment crisis, should also be asked to look into the whole question of the organization of peace-keeping operations under the Charter.

Then, finally, there are Canada's continental relations with her neighbour, who also happens to be the leader of what we, sometimes rather loosely, refer to as "the free world".

Good relations with the United States on the basis of mutual respect, of friendly co-operation rather than friendly domination, must be the very keystone of Canada's foreign policy.

Such a policy does not permit either automatic support or captious criticism. We must protect and advance our own national interests, but we should never forget that the greatest of these is peace and security. The achievement of this aim - it is chastening to realize - does not depend on our policies so much as it does on those of our neighbour. Therefore, the satisfaction we get from national identity and independence must be related to the requirements of interdependence and the recognition of the global responsibilities of the United States in the pursuit of objectives and values that we share.

This will mean, in practice, that our official doubts about certain U.S. foreign policies often should be expressed in private, through the channels of diplomacy, rather than publicly by speeches to Canadian Clubs. It does not mean that we must always remain silent if there is strong disagreement on matters of great moment or principle. Not at all. Canadians in official positions have more than once spoken very frankly about policies and actions of our neighbour. Washington ruefully refers to it as arm-twisting from a close friend. But we must never do this merely for the purpose of rousing a chauvinistic cheer at home. Pulling the eagle's tail feathers is an easy, but a dangerous, way to get a certain temporary popularity, as well as a feeling of self-satisfaction at having annoyed the big bird.

It's a form of indulgence that we should keep strictly under control - for national and international reasons.

A very good example of both the strength of the temptation and the necessity for control is to be found in the current situation in Vietnam.

We should be careful before hasty condemnation of U.S. retaliatory or deterrent reactions - a new phrase - against Communist Viet Cong attacks. We should remember that the Geneva arrangements of 1954 partitioned Vietnam and prohibited attacks from one side against the other; but the Northern Communist government, with Chinese backing, have from the beginning violated this agreement by continuous, Chinese-supported guerilla warfare in the South. There has been continuous armed provocation.