

Canadian membership was encouraged by the United States. "Friendly relations with the United States," observed a departmental memorandum in March 1944, "must precede cooperation with Latin American states" (document 720).

Within the Commonwealth (Chapter VII), the most important event was the holding, for the first and only time during the war, of a prime ministers' meeting in London in the spring of 1944. The preparations for this event prompted review of a broad range of Canadian policies, as documented in the relevant chapters. Although continuing support for the Commonwealth was not in question, Canadian sensitivity to suggestions of centralized decision-making in London was as acute as ever. One reason was not to undermine independent participation in the postwar international order. There was also still an important domestic dimension to the Canadian position on Commonwealth solidarity, as was made clear (document 731) when the British ambassador in Washington, Lord Halifax, lent support to the idea in a speech in Toronto in January 1944. Yet it was also recognized that, handled properly, the Commonwealth relationship could be a source of strength in international affairs (document 734). The task, therefore, was to exploit this opportunity while avoiding division on the Commonwealth connection at home or misunderstanding of Canada's international position abroad. This, it might be said, was the premise on which Canada approached the various questions arising from Commonwealth membership in 1944 and 1945.

Questions of autonomy also arose in the relationship with the United States (Chapter VIII), as a result of that country's interest in defence projects here and the stationing of large numbers of American personnel in remote parts of Canada. The ground rules, however, had been worked out earlier in the war, and the relationship, much of which involved arrangements to dismantle the projects or turn them over to Canadian control, proceeded comparatively smoothly. Defence relations were an important consideration in planning for the future. There was sensitivity to the vulnerability of Canada's position between the United States and the Soviet Union, should tensions between those two countries revive, and acceptance that the close relationship for continental defence which had developed during the war should continue, together with the instrument for coordination, the Permanent Joint Board on Defence. It was also recognized, that, to avoid the possibility of infringements on sovereignty, Canada should remain responsible for the defence of its own territory.

In other bilateral relationships (Chapter IX), the most interesting developments were perhaps those affecting France and the Soviet Union. Once the former had been liberated from the enemy, its international position ceased to be a matter of major concern to Canada for domestic or external reasons. The documentation on relations with France, therefore, is much less than in the earlier volumes on the war. With the defection of Igor Gouzenko just after the end of the war, it became apparent that relations with the Soviet Union would be much more troublesome than had been the case since the decision to establish diplomatic relations in 1942. Here was a clear warning that the geopolitical concerns affecting the defence relationship with the United States