

dependent, are themselves dependent upon the maintenance of peace. It would be quite unrealistic for any of us to ignore the fact that today that peace is threatened by the crisis which the Soviet Union has chosen to precipitate over Berlin.

I am sure that you are all sufficiently aware of the main issues at stake in Berlin to make it unnecessary for me to rehearse in detail the facts of the situation. Suffice it to say that the rights of the Western powers to be and remain in Berlin are well grounded in historical fact and in various four-power agreements, and that the Soviet attempt to alter those rights by unilateral action is an illegal and potentially dangerous development. Although one's reason tends to reject instinctively the possibility that East and West could stumble into war over Berlin, the grim facts are that on the Western side there is a solemn obligation not to abandon the 2.5 million inhabitants of West Berlin to the mercies of the Communist pressures by which they are surrounded, and, on the Soviet side, and apparently equal determination to put an end to the Four Power Agreements by virtue of which West Berlin remains today a window through which communist East Germany can observe a working democracy at close -- perhaps too close -- quarters. Although it is only the United States, United Kingdom and France who have direct occupation responsibilities in Berlin, Canada shares with other members of the North Atlantic Alliance the commitment to treat an attack upon Berlin as an attack upon itself. Canada has, therefore, a direct stake in seeing to it that the pursuit of conflicting interests in Berlin does not lead to war. For Berlin and for adequate negotiations Canada must "Look Out".

As recently as last year the world passed through dangerous moments -- first, in the Middle East, and then in the Far East -- where war was an imminent possibility. The Berlin crisis differs from those earlier crises in one fundamental respect which imbues it with an infinitely more menacing quality. It is that for the first time since the war we are witnessing a direct confrontation of the armed forces of the world's nuclear powers, with neither a buffer territory nor protege states between them that serve to limit the scope and scale of possible hostilities. Because both sides are alive to the ultimate futility of recourse to weapons of mutual annihilation, I am satisfied that neither would deliberately light the spark which could, by inexorable military logic, lead to their use. The danger, as I see it, therefore, lies in war by miscalculation.

It is for this reason that I have repeatedly called for a moratorium on such talk as "if you shoot, I will shoot" -- which only compounds the possibility of error. This is an age of nuclear weapons in which there is no room for belligerent challenges and responses of that nature. It is for this reason that the Canadian Government has called for flexibility in the approach to the problem of Berlin -- the kind