

controversies of last autumn, perhaps I may be pardoned for quoting from a speech I made in Halifax on January 26, 1952. I said then, and I repeat now:

"...It should be and is a first principle of Canadian policy to maintain and strengthen the Commonwealth association, under the Crown, which is and will remain not only its symbol, but which also demonstrates the continuity of our own history and the depth of its roots.

"Our Commonwealth of Nations is continually renewing its usefulness in different forms. It is of particular value at the present time in that it acts, through its three Asian members, as a bridge, one of the few bridges, between the East and the West. We cannot, I think, stress too much or too often the importance of our family of nations in this regard. It is one of the great new services that the Commonwealth is giving the world."

There remains the third of the international obligations which were bound to influence our attitude at the United Nations during the last Assembly, and, indeed, which should influence our approach to international problems generally. This is our obligation to the Western coalition, of which we are a member, to take no avoidable action which weakens its unity and strength; particularly as it is organized in NATO.

No one, especially no Canadian, can feel anything but the deepest regret and the most acute worry when our neighbours to the South and our Mother Country disagree, except those communist forces who see in such disagreement a great help to their own aggressive designs. Those forces were full of glee last autumn, just as they are now trying to conceal their chagrin and disappointment at the encouraging results of the Bermuda Conference. But just as all Canadians felt, I think, a special anxiety when the policies of the United Kingdom and the United States diverged last autumn over the Middle East, so they felt a corresponding relief when they began to come together again - as they have done.

It is a first principle of Canadian foreign policy to co-operate closely with the two countries with whom every impulse of sentiment, history, self-interest, trade and geography counsels such co-operation. We must try to keep in step with both the United Kingdom and the United States, but that is not easy when they are not in step with each other. We are in trouble then, as we were at the United Nations last autumn over this break in the united front.

This is no time for recrimination over the past, but for restoration of unity of policy and purpose among friends. Examination of the past is only useful if it helps us to avoid mistakes in the future. Perhaps, then, we will profit in the field of North Atlantic co-operation from its collapse over the Suez. I certainly hope so. But I venture to say - and my view is founded on an experience extending now over some years in the