

speaker, frank almost to the point of crudity -- when he said that in 1941 the United Kingdom organized and arranged the attack by the Nazis on the Soviet Union, it is very difficult indeed to believe that he, as a Soviet leader, is ignorant of what the facts were at that time. Therefore if you do not believe he is so ignorant, and that is hard to believe, then you must believe that he is doing this for some bad political purpose.

It is just as well in the face of this kind of remark we should recall that in 1941 when Great Britain was being charged by the Soviet leader with organizing the attack on the Soviet Russia by the Nazis, Great Britain and the nations of the Commonwealth were standing almost alone against the tyranny and terror of Nazi might. Indian troops, maybe some of whom were in Mr. Khrushchev's audiences in India, were fighting with us at that time to save Europe and the world from Nazi aggression; from Nazi military tyranny which at that time was being aided and abetted by the Soviet Union. If remarks of that kind are based on ignorance it is frightening to think that the destiny of 175 million people in Russia, and therefore our own destiny to some extent, is in the hands of such men. If it was not based on ignorance, it must be based on a calculated effort to cause trouble. It throws a lurid light indeed on the "Spirit of Geneva" about which I heard so much in Russia and which along with millions of other people in the world, we so warmly welcomed at that time.

To sum it all up, we came back to Canada feeling that so far as the Soviet Union was concerned the likelihood of a military attack was not great providing we retain enough military strength in the West - in NATO and in other places - to remove the temptation provided by the hope of easy victory. If we remain strong militarily there is not likely to be all-out aggression. But that does not mean there is not going to be conflict. We are, indeed, in a new kind of conflict. We have been in it for some time. We are just beginning to appreciate its importance and its significance: conflict, short of all-out war.

It is one thing to prepare for a military aggression. It is probably more difficult and just as important to prepare to meet political aggression. For that purpose we not only have to be politically and socially and economically strong, we have to be united in the free world. Above all we have got to be united in NATO, the annual Council meeting of which, with two colleagues in the government, I am attending at the beginning of next week. One way of being politically strong is not to be lulled into a sense of false security by blandishments; not to allow relaxation of tension, which we must welcome whenever and wherever it occurs, to lead into relaxation of effort.

Another way to be politically strong is to use all the resources of diplomacy whenever there is a real opportunity to negotiate. It is easier to negotiate, indeed, now when we are strong. Our strength is, after all, only a means to an end and that end is the peaceful solution of the problems which at present divide the world.