

that you cannot rely on what men say publicly nowadays, that what they say when they are preparing to go to a San Francisco conference or to a Bretton Woods conference or to some other conference is deliberately designed to veil the truth and to convey, to people who hear and read, something which is altogether different from the facts that underlie what is being said.

I believe that in the case of the Atlantic pact and the developments going forward before us at the present time a similar thing to that is going on. So that the great rank and file of the people simply do not know what is being plotted against their peace. I should like to devote some time to a discussion of that general point of view. I may be wrong, but I am very much afraid I am right.

I should like to refer to an article appearing in the *Christian Science Monitor* of May 27, 1950, page 1, by Roscoe Drummond. From that article I should like to read several quotations which I believe will make very interesting reading for the folks who live out in the country and who do not ordinarily have a chance to read the news as near, shall I say, the root of things. They will be surprised when they hear what Mr. Roscoe Drummond thinks ought to come out of the apparently innocent-looking economic proposals of this most laudable Atlantic pact, which has promised us everything but the millennium, just the way the United Nations did—everything but the millennium. And the Bretton Woods agreement—all we needed to do was to sign that worthless thing, and immediately we would have no more trouble at all, financially and economically! That was just the beginning of all our troubles!

And this is another of the same kind. May I read from this article. These are the things which Mr. Roscoe Drummond thinks ought to be achieved in order thoroughly to implement the economic proposals which constitute an integral part of the Atlantic pact:

1. To hold more frequent meetings of the Big Three foreign ministers in order to concert American, British and French foreign policy.

No serious objection to that.

2. To build up the machinery of the North Atlantic peace alliance so that it can begin to play an economic and political role, not merely a defence role.

What is envisaged by that economic role? What is envisaged by that political role? I am deeply concerned to know what they mean. Then:

3. To put American military leadership at the top of a new supreme western defence staff to bring about a totally integrated Atlantic defence.

What is the meaning of "totally integrated"? I wish I knew.

4. To seize moral and intellectual initiative in the cold war and keep before the whole world the peaceful purposes of the free nations.

Just as though we needed anything to tell the world what our peaceful purposes are. Dear me, we have been voicing them abroad, all over the world, for several years. If they are what we say they are, everybody ought to know by now.

5. To bring Germany into full-scale peaceful partnership economically and politically, with the west.

"Full scale peaceful partnership economically and politically"—sounds very beautiful, but what does it actually mean? Then, a little further on, he begins to particularize. These are the things he would have done if we brought these beautiful words into some sort of implementation:

1. To make the United States nearly a full partner in the development of a union of the western nations.

Now, what would that union be like? What would be meant by "a full partner", or "nearly a full partner"? That is not made clear at all. He does not try to make it clear. It seems to me that we in this debate right here and now ought to know something about what these things mean. Then:

2. To require Britain to decide before long whether it is going to play a role of active leadership in western Europe or whether it is going to force France and Germany to seek a settlement by themselves.

What is meant by "a role of active leadership in western Europe"? Why in the world should there be any group of people whose business it is to be "requiring" Great Britain? This kind of thing absolutely astounds me. Here is a nation that stood out to save mankind twice since the turn of the century, and impudent people like this are talking about requiring her, as though she did not have sense enough to know what she wanted to do, and enough intelligence to go ahead and do it. One would think that the world's major villain was Britain, that she had been responsible for all the ills of mankind for at least two hundred years, instead of having been the saviour of mankind twice in our generation.

It is time we knew something about what all this means. Then he asks this question:

3. Will the United States become a partner in the unification of the western nations?

There is the word "unification" again.

No theoretical answer would seem possible at this stage. But events are moving in that direction.

And then, further down:

It is becoming evident that no realistic defence of western Europe can be had unless it is organized