

In the Soviet Union, I did my best, whenever I had the chance, to convince those whom I met and talked with that in the West we too desired peace and that our regional collective security arrangements, such as NATO, originated and grew up only because of our own fears of war, and because of the failure of the United Nations to give us the security that would banish those fears. I insisted that these arrangements were purely and exclusively defensive, and that my own country would have nothing to do with them if they were anything else.

When NATO was formed, we had good reason to fear aggression and a policy by which an aggressor could in Europe attack and defeat his disunited victims, one by one. If that fear had not existed, or if the United Nations had been able to provide collective security on a universal basis, there would have been no need for, and therefore no justification for, NATO. It follows that if circumstances change, if fear of war can be removed, and if the United Nations can effectively discharge the security functions visualized in the Charter, then - but only then - should NATO, or any other defensive collective security system, which represents a genuine coming together of the countries concerned, disappear.

In putting this point of view forward in Moscow, I had at least one great asset. I sincerely believed what I said. I also asserted - and I believe this too - that the United States of America which is by far the most powerful member of the Western coalition, will never commit any military aggression or deliberately provoke any military conflict.

We in Canada know our southern neighbours well; better, I think, than any other people do. We do not blindly follow or even support all American policies or actions, especially, if I may so say, in Asia. We do not like all the manifestations of their way of life as, I am sure, they do not like all of ours in Canada. To use a North American expression, they "sound off" easily. So do some Canadians, and possibly even some Indians! They occasionally say things that are regrettable. These outbursts make the world headlines, while the disapproval and condemnation of them by the sensible, serious, quiet and decent Americans, who make up the vast majority of the nation, are rarely cabled across the oceans.

Canadians, I ventured to suggest in Moscow - as I have in other places - know that the American people are good neighbours and good friends - possibly the least aggressively-minded people in the military sense that ever achieved massive power. If this were not so, Canada, rich in resources and very strategically placed from the American point of view, but with less than 16 millions of people, would not exist today at all; or only as an American vassal state, which, I assure you, we are not.

Canada's foreign relations - our day-to-day international problems - are concerned, to a large extent, with our southern neighbour. My few days in Russia, however, made me more aware than previously of the fact that we had a northern neighbour as well, with whom we in Canada, as you in India, would like to have good relations.

There is another matter which concerns us much in Canada; maintenance of the closest possible contact with the members of the Commonwealth of Nations. One of those members, the United Kingdom, is the mother-land of many Canadians, and the source of many ideas that mean much to us, as they do to you in India; free parliamentary government, the rule of law,