

On the first resolution, then, the United Kingdom, Australia and New Zealand were opposed; India, Pakistan and Ceylon strongly in favour. Canada and South Africa abstained. Our position was that while we supported the cease-fire in principle, the resolution did nothing to organize any United Nations machinery to supervise and secure it; or to recognize that the United Nations had responsibility for dealing with the issues which brought about the military intervention. We thought the resolution was inadequately drawn and too hastily put to a vote.

We knew that same evening, however, that both the United States and the United Kingdom would support a move on our part to set up a United Nations Emergency Force to operate in the area in order to make a resumption of hostilities more difficult. So from that time we devoted our efforts largely to this matter, with the full support of our friends in London, the other Commonwealth countries, and in Washington. In this effort, and in other Middle East discussions to follow, any difference of opinion which we had with the United Kingdom over the advisability of the original intervention did not interfere with the closest and, as the United Kingdom Prime Minister has put it, "the most comradely" contact.

We have never condemned, though we regretted, the military action which the United Kingdom felt it necessary to take after the Israeli troops marched. We have tried to understand the provocations behind and the reasons for that action; especially the vital importance to the United Kingdom of a Suez Canal "insulated from the policies of any single government". On its part, the United Kingdom has, I think, respected the motives behind our policies; our desire to remove or mitigate differences and disunity between friends by working out constructive measures at the United Nations; and our anxiety to keep the Commonwealth from splitting apart into Eastern - Western groups with perhaps fatal results to an association which has meant, and still means, so much to the world.

It was a distressing experience for any Canadian delegate at the United Nations not to be able to give full support to the United Kingdom on all matters at the UN last autumn. When we differed, it was with reluctance. Canadian policy, however, at the United Nations and elsewhere has to be determined primarily by Canadian considerations, and Canadian interests, and, in my opinion, requires that Canada should not automatically follow any other government, however close and friendly. But at the same time, we should not pursue this Canadian policy in any narrow, selfish way, but with a full realization that the greatest Canadian national interest is international peace and security and that this interest is prejudiced when there is division within the Commonwealth or between London and Washington and Paris.

Lest it may appear that this feeling I have expressed for the Commonwealth is a recent growth from the shock of the