

*External Affairs*

because of an alleged new United States doctrine. This criticism is of course linked with the more general allegation made by some hon. members opposite that at the United Nations and elsewhere we have been the chore boy, the satellite, the follower or whatever you wish to call it, of the United States. Well, the record can speak for itself and it is far more impressive as evidence than any gibes can be.

For instance, on nine important substantive resolutions concerning the Middle East at the current United Nations assembly we voted with the United States, or perhaps I should say the United States voted with us six times and they did not vote with us three times. That does not indicate that we were a very docile satellite. In addition we rejected a United States invitation to sponsor a resolution on February 2 because we thought it did not go far enough in providing for United Nations arrangements after the Israeli withdrawal. We let the United States delegation know quite clearly that we would vote against the Arab resolution of sanctions against Israel, whatever they might do.

So let some of those who charge us with tagging after Washington at the United Nations and not co-operating with the United Kingdom go down to New York and talk to the members of the United States and United Kingdom delegations to the assembly, or go to Washington and talk to the state department or to members of the national press club.

The fact is that the policy which this government formulates and follows in foreign affairs is a Canadian policy determined by Canadian interests and Canadian considerations, the greatest of which is peace. When I say that, I do not mean that our policy is or can be an exclusive or isolationist policy. The greatest Canadian national interest, as I have said, in this thermonuclear age is peace and we know that there can be no guarantee of peace through national policy alone or no assurance of security from national isolation. So we have to work with our friends and we try to do that.

The third charge, which has been dealt with previously in this house and which has been repeated lately by the official opposition and therefore I think should be mentioned, is that because of our actions in recent months we have indicated we are no true believers in the commonwealth associations because we did not go "down the line"—that was the phrase used—with the United Kingdom last autumn, the consequences of doing which I have mentioned already in this house.

[Mr. Pearson.]

The hon. member for Vancouver-Quadra (Mr. Green) accused us the other night—my notes have an interesting misprint because they say "The hon. member for Vancouver-Quadra accused us the other night"—I certainly would not accuse the hon. member of that because he is always courteous in his accusations—over the air, and I quote from the record of his broadcast, of "knifing" Britain—

**Mr. Green:** That is exactly what you did.

**Mr. Pearson:** —and France and Israel in the back last autumn.

**Mr. Green:** That is exactly what you did.

**Mr. Pearson:** We will see about that. And of jumping in to attack the mother country when we tried to bring about a solution to the problem through United Nations action and particularly through setting up the United Nations emergency force.

**Mr. Green:** On a question of privilege. I do not mind the minister quoting what I said, but I wish he would do so correctly. I did not say that about the United Nations emergency force. As he knows, we supported the sending of it.

**Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member merely said we knifed the United Kingdom and France in the back last autumn by the policy we adopted at the United Nations.

**Mr. Hodgson:** That's right.

**Mr. Green:** If the minister wants to quote me, let him quote exactly what I said.

**Mr. Hodgson:** Tell the truth.

**Mr. Green:** I said that Canada's action by jumping into the lead—

**Mr. Pearson:** Very well; I accept that correction, and say that the hon. member accuses us of knifing the United Kingdom and France in the back by jumping into the lead to adopt the policy we followed. The hon. member has also indicated his support for the United Nations emergency force, but I point out once again that if we had adopted the policy advocated by his party last autumn there would have been no United Nations emergency force.

The reason for that is perfectly clear, because we were accused, by the hon. member for Kamloops (Mr. Fulton), for instance, of lining up with the Russians because we voted against the United Kingdom when they tried to get this matter off the agenda. And if it had been got off the agenda, how could there have been a United Nations emergency force?