

since then in Korea and in the United Nations Forces in the Middle East, and Congo and elsewhere.

"Canada, as a member of NATO and NORAD, has a special right to speak and be heard concerning the rights and responsibilities which the three principal Western Powers - Great Britain, the United States and France - possess and discharge in Berlin.

"Canada in NATO is responsible for its share of European defence, to which we contribute an army brigade and an air division. Under NATO we have undertaken to regard an armed attack against Berlin as if it were an attack on Canada. We have further responsibilities under NORAD for our share of North American defence.

#### LEGALITY OF WESTERN STAND

"What are the unchallengeable facts regarding West Berlin? The Western world is confronted with a crisis over international agreements which have been repudiated by the U.S.S.R., which it endeavours to justify by specious and trumped-up allegations.

"The agreements are clear as to the rights of the signatories. The pertinent documents include the Protocol on the Zones of Co-operation dated September 12, 1944, and confirmed on June 5th, 1945, in which three zones, not only in the territory of Germany but also in Berlin, were set up for occupation by the forces of the U.S.S.R., Great Britain and the United States respectively. Subsequently a French zone was introduced.

"The first attempt at repudiation of these agreements was made by the U.S.S.R. in June 1948, when a blockade was imposed. Had that blockade been successful, it would have strangled Berlin. Berlin was saved by an airlift unique in history. Finally, in May 1949, by agreement between the Western powers and the U.S.S.R., provision was made that all restrictions imposed before the blockade by the U.S.S.R. on communications, transportation and trade would be removed and ended. This was followed by a meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers which on June 30th, 1949, issued a communiqué containing, *inter alia*, the following provisions:

"...The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom, and the United States agree that the New York agreement of May 1949 shall be maintained. Moreover, in order to promote further the aims set forth in the preceding paragraphs and in order to improve and supplement this and other arrangements and arrangements as regards the movement of persons and goods and communications between the Eastern Zone and the Western Zones and between the Zones and Berlin and also in regard to transit, the occupation authorities, each in his own Zone, will have an obligation to take the measures necessary to ensure the normal functioning and utilization of rail, water, and road transport for such movement of persons and goods and such communication by post, telephone and telegraph..."

"These arrangements were arrived at in the mistaken belief and assumption by the Western allies that wartime co-operation with the Soviet Union would continue and that the occupation of Germany would not be indefinite.

"These agreements are still in effect and the Western rights of occupation and access are beyond question. Yet Mr. Khrushchov has declared his intention to terminate these agreements unilaterally and to transfer Soviet responsibility under the Four Power Agreement to the East German regime, professing that Soviet withdrawal is not intended to interfere with Western rights in West Berlin.

#### FIRMNESS IN BERLIN ESSENTIAL

"His action in practice would mean that in the future the Western powers would be obliged to apply to the East German regime for rights of access to West Berlin. For the West to be compelled to deal with the East German regime without guarantees would be to place Western rights of access in jeopardy. To agree to the Soviet demands would be to consign the West Berliners to the mercy of their Communist compatriots.

"Western rights have given rise to responsibilities for the future of two and a half million people living in West Berlin who are entirely dependent for their freedom on the continuance of access to and with the West. There are those who would have us believe that freedom for West Berlin would not be threatened if the West yielded to pressures to withdraw. How can such an argument be accepted against the background of the blockade of 1949, and the Communist pressure which has been steadily mounting to the point of danger in recent weeks?

"Retreat in Berlin, by the sacrifice of the pledged word, would mean that the pledged word of the West would be called in question everywhere in the world with consequences impossible to calculate for the future of freedom....

#### A SEDUCTIVE FALLACY

"I have heard it contended that we should not take a firm stand on West Berlin because (to put it bluntly) Canada's sacrifice in two world wars against Germany should deny any attitude but one of indifference to the people of that city.

"That argument, with its understandable appeal to those who served and sacrificed, fails to recognize that Western eviction from West Berlin would have repercussions through Germany and Europe. It would find freedom in Canada and everywhere in the world wounded dangerously if not beyond recovery. In any event it would mean that the Communist world would be strengthened physically and psychologically and would encourage new and further crises elsewhere in the world wherever it suited the Kremlin's purpose to create them.

"The U.S.S.R. contends that German militarism is not dead, that West Germany has aggressive designs and that the NATO alliance may be drawn into military action to recover former German territory. The answer of the West is that West Germany is solemnly pledged to seek reunification by peaceful means only, and that German forces are fully integrated within NATO - an alliance dedicated wholly to the defence of freedom.

"Moreover, as with all NATO governments, the West German Government has made it clear that it is prepared to negotiate with the U.S.S.R. and to consider all reasonable proposals. Within and not