

foreign policy. The armed strength of the Soviet Union, which is now in process of being revamped and modernized, is a central fact which I suggest we cannot and must not ignore, especially when we consider our own defence plans and defence policies.

Mr. Khrushchev, speaking at the recent 20th party congress in Moscow, said:

We must resolve to take all measures necessary to strengthen further the defence potential of our socialist state.

It is well to remember this when we read of Soviet proposals to demobilize soldiers and when we receive appeals to take it easy and to throw away our arms because the danger has now disappeared. This strengthening, moreover, applies not merely to the Soviet State itself but to what the Soviet leaders call—and they never seem to weary of referring to it—the international camp of socialism, something which, of course, is quite peaceful and respectable although our own coalitions are always referred to by them as aggressive military blocs.

Therefore, I think that all Members will agree with me that we in the Western world must remain on guard. But while all this is true, and it certainly is true, I think it is also true that since the death of Stalin the Soviet Government and the Soviet regime have begun to eliminate some of the more objectionable features of both their foreign and domestic policies. There have been relaxations at home, and as a result I believe that certain internal pressures may be developing in Russia which could have a restraining influence on the activities of the Soviet leaders. These Russian leaders may have started a train of events which, under normal conditions, should be welcome to the bulk of their population with whom the dynamism of revolutions has probably run down. That process may become increasingly difficult to reverse at home if it is permitted to gain momentum there, but it is certainly not likely to lead, as we sometimes hopefully think, to parliamentary democracy or to any kind of democracy as we understand it because that is possible in a communist state and Russia under its new leaders remains determinedly communist.

Also it is too soon to say, I think, that irresistible forces of freedom have been set in motion, and that this means a great triumph for the Western world. Indeed, these relaxations and their results, both at home and among their satellite communities, may frighten the new rulers who may try to reverse the trend, and out of this effort a new Stalin, Khrushchev or somebody else may arise as the old Stalin arose out of the ruins of the new economic policy in the twenties. This accession of one man to power is consistent both with the Slav tradition of autocratic rule and the communist doctrine of what they call democratic centralism.

So we would be wise, I think, to welcome and exploit any changes that seem for the better in both domestic and foreign policies of the Soviet Union without exaggerating their extent or being bedazzled or deceived by them. At the same time, we must