

conduct of international affairs - that this desirable result will not be achieved, unless there is closer, more frank and more continuous consultation over policies, especially in the NATO Council, in the future than there has been in the past. Surely this should be a first requirement for every member of the coalition.

It should not be assumed that if Canada differs with the United Kingdom on any issue, even temporarily, that this difference is either the cause or the result of some alignment with the United States. Canada must, as a free nation, decide questions on her own responsibility, and not follow automatically any one, however desirous we may be of promoting unity within the group. There are bound to be influences and impulses that have an effect on our policies. Some of them I have mentioned. But we are no satellite of any other body, and this includes that magnetic and dynamic and, at times, almost overwhelming political body to the south of us.

May I again quote from what I said on this matter five years ago, because I think the sentiment is just as valid now as it was then:

"So far as the United States is concerned, there are no two countries in the world whose relations are closer and more intimate than those between our two countries. ... Naturally, as the United States possesses so much the greatest power in the free world coalition, and as its influence is correspondingly greater than the others, the rest of us are preoccupied, at times intensely preoccupied, as to how that power will be used and how that leadership will be exercised. This is, of course, a perfectly natural reaction. This actual disparity of power, however, has to be reconciled with the legal equality of all states inside the coalition. We are all free and equal in theory, and we cherish that theory on which our national freedom is based. So, naturally, we speak and act as free states, not as the communist satellites in a Kremlin camp. I am quite sure that the United States would not have it otherwise, because otherwise our support would not be worth having. ..."

I think that Canada's record at the last United Nations Assembly supports this theory of friendship and neighbourliness, without subservience or dependence.

On three important Middle Eastern resolutions we were, to our regret, unable to vote with the United States delegation, on six, happily, we were. We were also not able to accept a United States invitation to sponsor an important resolution, with them and others, because we did not think it went far enough in providing for United Nations control in Gaza and on the demarcation line after the withdrawal of Israeli forces. And we let the United States delegation know that we would have to vote against any resolution of sanctions against Israel in the circumstances that existed, whatever they might be.