

*Supply—External Affairs*

at the meeting which is today convened in London to the end that those three nations will realize that we in the free world are united.

Just a few minutes ago the minister laid some emphasis upon the need for unity. In my opinion, never before has it been more necessary and never before would it have given that encouragement and support which the statesmen meeting there and joined to us in bonds of freedom have the right to expect.

I am going to speak for a few minutes on the viewpoints expressed by the minister as to the changed attitude on the part of the U.S.S.R., in particular the change which has taken place since the meeting of the 20th congress in February last.

Everyone in the free world is still questioning the meaning of the destruction of Stalin's halo. He has been exhumed and his halo has been knocked from his head by axe and hatchet men who climbed to power by remaining his subservient dupes. Even as late as a year ago I was in East Germany and saw there something of the worship of Stalin. In every town and village, in monument and in picture, he was represented as a leader beyond reproach, one who in the words of Khrushchev was above all others the most trusted leader the world had ever seen.

Why the revelation indicating that he is a combination of mass murderer, torturer, leader of deportations and destroyer of the courts? Why should he now be pictured as a person who by mass starvation destroyed opposition? Why should he be revealed as a person to whom freedom under law consisted in the courts carrying out whatever orders he might direct or determine? I think the words quoted by Khrushchev indicate that the courts had ceased to be protectors even in the slightest degree, the words of Stalin when he communicated with the head of the security branch when the Moscow doctors were charged with having plotted against Stalin. Stalin said, "I want confessions, and if you do not obtain confessions from the doctors I will shorten you by a head." He said, according to Khrushchev's words, "It is a very simple way to get confessions. Beat, beat, and once again beat to get confessions; that is your responsibility."

Khrushchev also indicated the danger of being in public life when he stated that, of the 139 members of the communist party central committee of the seventeenth congress, 98 had been arrested and shot while they were still members of the organization.

Why the revelation? I presume that we in our generation will never find out. Why did those who followed Stalin in obsequious

support find it necessary last February in an ideological convulsion to turn their backs on Stalin while at the same time failing in even the slightest degree to offer to return the loot and the spoils of his wrong-doing or even to show remorse for the mass deportation and enslavement of peoples? These are questions that we ask today.

Has the U.S.S.R. changed? The minister, I think, gave the answer, that while there appears to be a mental change there is nothing to indicate that there has been brought about a change of heart or, indeed, of destination. World tension has subsided. That is one thing that has happened. Sir Anthony Eden said a week ago today that for the moment an economic invasion seems to have been substituted for war, and he said he preferred an economic invasion to cold war. But everywhere in the world, while the leadership of the U.S.S.R. gives indication of a change, they continue their work to undermine those organizations of the free world that assure freedom.

The minister mentioned the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. I should like him to deal, when he replies, with the terrible effect on North American defence which will result should Iceland decide, not to disavow NATO, but to deny NATO the bases upon which North American defence can be pivoted. What are the hopes of assuring that the airfields at Keflavik will remain under NATO, regardless of whether the United States, by force of circumstances and by orders of the new Icelandic government with communist assistance, has to withdraw? What will be the effect on the north anchor of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization if Iceland persists in the stand that it is taking? The action taken by the government of Iceland cannot but arouse fears that the U.S.S.R., by its modified policy of wanton smiles, is achieving a melting of the mortar binding NATO together.

The minister mentioned that he believed that more and more political unity is important in the shift that has taken place on the part of the U.S.S.R. from military to economic aims. I wish he would amplify that. What has been achieved as a result of the meetings so far on the part of NATO, in connection with the economic features of the U.S.S.R. world offensive? Has there been any move to assure that among the NATO nations there is a realization of the need of the preservation of our economic strength? Has there been any degree of acceptance on the part of the members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization of the need of removing tariffs that today prevent that exchange so necessary of goods between those nations, so that in solidarity and unity NATO may be