

relationship with them. Or, to put it another way, unless we assure them by word and deed that our participation in NATO is complementary to and not in conflict with our membership in the Commonwealth and in the United Nations we may not be able to make much appeal to them.

Canada is a middle power with roots in the three associations, in NATO, in the Commonwealth and in the United Nations. I think Canada has a special reason for avoiding an absolutely rigid dependence on any one of these organizations as the sole instrument or channel of its foreign policy.

I come now to my final point in relation to the NATO meeting projected for Paris in December. The House will not expect me - and even if it did I could not do this - to predict the specific terms of the agenda or the likely outcome of the deliberations. I am more concerned to suggest to this House the general philosophy which I think should govern our approach to that meeting. We must... start from the premise that new and intensified efforts at military and scientific co-operation are essential, and we must be prepared to do our part in developing that co-operation. We must, in the second place, in view of the unhappy events of the last two or three weeks, renew our determination to consult frankly on issues which have caused, or are likely to cause, divisions in NATO. And, thirdly, to return to the point I was trying to make a few moments ago, we must assure the world outside NATO that no one need fear aggression from us; that far from regarding the forthcoming meeting as an end in itself, the whole world, including ourselves, regards it as a symbol of our determination to protect ourselves and, no less important, of our genuine and sustained interest in finding ultimate peaceful solutions to the issues that divide us from the communist world.

I have endeavoured to put before this House a diagram of Canada's relations with other nations. Nothing that I have said should obscure our intense resolution to reduce tensions between the West and the U.S.S.R. No sane person could run the risk of shutting any promising door on the possibility of co-existence. Yet - and this is not double talk - we should not fall into a propaganda plot; we should not be lulled into complacency by empty or hollow professions such as happened after the Geneva meeting. We must keep up our defences pending the arrival of the day for which we have hoped, the arrival of the day of substantial mutual trust between the West and the East. And I should add this: we must have convincing proof that the U.S.S.R. has abandoned its policies of domination. Co-existence cannot be used as a cover for subversion on the part of the U.S.S.R. in free countries. What I have been trying to say, Sir, is that we must keep our powder dry and put the hand out.