

arms made available through our mutual aid programme to our allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

I may say that we are quite satisfied with the present procedure, and we are not anxious to have it changed -- the procedure under which recommendations for the allocation of these arms are made by the standing group of the NATO organization. But if a proposal emanated from the conference which concerned our allocation of mutual aid, then of course we would give it consideration.

Now, finally -- and this is final -- I wish to come back just for a moment to the argument, the most impressive one to my mind advanced against this policy, that these agreements will not make for peace but will make for division and controversy and renewed trouble in Europe; that they will provoke the Soviets into violent reaction, and will drive that country into intransigent Stalinism again at a time when its government, under new leaders, seems to be getting somewhat more co-operative and less hostile.

As to the first, I do not think there is cause for undue alarm over Soviet threats to retaliate -- and we have heard these threats in strong language -- by forming a heavily armed eastern European alliance. While we should never dismiss pronouncements from Moscow as unworthy of serious examination, I do not think we should become unduly worried by Soviet "kicks" any more than we should become unduly elated by Soviet "carrots". Both are often offered for the same purpose, to weaken our resolve and confuse our purpose.

There is certainly no reality behind the threat of an eastern NATO, because they have now a military alliance system, as I have tried to show, which is already more heavily armed than NATO, and under complete Soviet control. There are certainly no limitations or controls over armaments or men or anything else in that line. They could hardly go any further. As to the second point, there is no possible validity to the contention that these agreements justify or make inevitable an intensification by the Soviet Union of the cold war, at a time when it seemed to be lessening.

I point this out because in the harsh and unreasonable things which the Soviet government has been saying recently about western policies, there is the constant accusation that western nations respond to offers of peace and friendship from the Soviet Union by the warlike action of arming Germans for an eventual attack on the Soviet Union. It is hard to believe that the Soviet leaders can make these claims seriously.