

the situation here or a deterioration there; in Western Europe some of the feeling of imminent crisis and danger has disappeared; in Asia it has increased. But the menace of Soviet imperialism exploiting the doctrine of revolutionary Communism, with its conscious agents in the members of every Communist party in the world, including the one in Canada — that menace remains. We should never forget for one moment that we are facing the cruellest, most-powerful, best-organized conspiracy in all history. But this doesn't mean that the conspiracy will inevitably erupt in World War Three. It may or it may not. The decision is not primarily and directly in the hands of the free world. It is in the minds of the conspirators of Moscow. Our duty — we who are free — is to do what we can to convince them that if they make the wrong decision they will meet a powerful and united resistance by the free world, and one which gives them no chance of success. By so doing, we can influence powerfully the decision against aggressive military action.

This organization of resistance to aggression should be, and one day, we must hope, will be through the United Nations. At the moment, this is not possible and so today our most effective agency for building up our collective strength to preserve the peace is NATO.

It was, I think, in this room on September 2, 1947, many months before the North Atlantic Treaty was actually signed, that I ventured to say:

If forced, we might make special security arrangements within the United Nations, inviting all those member states to participate in them who are willing to build up an agency within the Organization which would have the power which the whole Organization does not possess under the Charter . . . If it is desired to work out a special arrangement for collective security to include those democratic and freedom-loving states who are willing to give up certain sovereign rights in the interests of peace and safety, why shouldn't it be done? Especially as any arrangement of this kind would have to be consistent with the Charter of the United Nations.

Well, it has been done through the signature of the North Atlantic Treaty and the establishment of a strong organization of co-operating states under that Treaty.

Recently, I think the feeling has developed that the high hopes that have been placed on NATO for our collective defence and the building of an enduring structure for co-operation between the member governments are not being realized.

On the one hand, there are those who think that we have — by our decisions at Lisbon — imposed impossible military targets on the various governments and that the effort to achieve them is resulting in economic weakness and social and political division — the very result that the forces of Communist imperialism hope for. It is charged by some that in NATO we are subordinating economic and political co-operation to exaggerated and excessive military plans and preparations. Others are genuinely worried because NATO, which now has a permanent home, a permanent organization and a permanent Council in Paris, is not developing as it should in the non-military field; that the big powers are making their own decisions and ignoring NATO in the process.

On the other hand, there are those who, remembering the capacity of Soviet Russia to set in motion at any moment a military machine that could overrun and crush the forces of Western Europe, are anxious and impatient because our defence plans are inadequate and we are taking too long in putting even these inadequate plans into operation.

It is, of course, easy and wishful to comfort ourselves by merely repeating that everything is fine with NATO, in its defence of the peace and its promise of the future. This, however, is not good enough. Continuous and vigilant examination of the operations of representative and executive international bodies is as important as it is in national governmental agencies. NATO, subjected to such an examination —