

Organization where they would only be one of 15 members, including the United States, and which they could not hope to dominate". . . .

Any alternative he could think of, he went on, would mean the end of the Atlantic alliance, and end the move toward European unification.

Later, he said:

"Now, finally, I wish to come back just for a moment to the argument, the most impressive one to my mind advanced against this policy, that these agreements will not make for peace but will make for division and controversy and renewed trouble in Europe that they will provoke the Soviets into violent reaction, and will drive that country into intransigent Stalinism again at a time when its Government, under new leaders, seems to be getting somewhat more co-operative and less hostile.

"As to the first, I do not think there is cause for undue alarm over Soviet threats to retaliate - and we have heard these threats in strong language - by forming a heavily armed eastern European alliance. While we should never dismiss pronouncements from Moscow as unworthy of serious examination, I do not think we should become unduly worried by Soviet 'kicks' any more than we should become unduly elated by Soviet 'carrots'. Both are often offered for the same purpose, to weaken our resolve and confuse our purpose.

EASTERN ALLIANCE

"There is certainly no reality behind the threat of an eastern NATO, because they have now a military alliance system, as I have tried to show, which is already more heavily armed than NATO, and under complete Soviet control. There are certainly no limitations or controls over armaments or men or anything else in that line. They could hardly go any further. As to the second point, there is no possible validity to the contention that these agreements justify or make inevitable an intensification by the Soviet Union of the cold war, at a time when it seemed to be lessening.

"I point this out because in the harsh and unreasonable things which the Soviet Government has been saying recently about western policies, there is the constant accusation that western nations respond to offers of peace and friendship from the Soviet Union by the war-like action of arming Germans for an eventual attack on the Soviet Union. It is hard to believe that Soviet leaders can make these claims seriously.

"The Soviet Government has never shown any inclination to discuss these agreements on a rational basis, or to take any reasonable attitude toward Germany or Austria. It has avoided constructive discussion and made no attempt to find out about or to seek reassurance on any point about western policy toward the German Federal Republic which it regarded as menacing to the Soviet Union.

"No one of course would deny to the Soviet Union, which suffered so cruelly from German arms, the right to issue warnings about German militarism. But we cannot regard Soviet judgments on this subject as superior to those of other nations, which also suffered from the same source". . . .

"So we would be unwise and shortsighted if we yielded to Soviet threats about what will happen if these agreements are ratified: Nor in my view will that ratification provoke war-like retaliation, unless the Soviet Government, for other reasons, desires to pursue such a belligerent policy.

"I think myself, Mr. Speaker, that the chance that such retaliation will happen and war might follow are less now than they were last summer after EDC was rejected. On our part we have made it abundantly clear that NATO policies in Europe are defensive and pacific. . . .

"We know that the political and moral values which we cherish and the political system on which we rely do not thrive in conditions of war or continued tension. Our preparations are made for defence only, and war is for us not a means of combatting ideologies which we do not like. Therefore any genuine Soviet move to lessen tension, even if it affects only a limited area of international relations, should be welcomed by us, and we should be willing to go half way at any time to meet it.

"There is, of course, the constant danger of conflict from a misunderstanding on both sides of each others motives. In the West we remain with good reason alarmed by the threatening and aggressive policies of the USSR in recent years. In turn I think it is not inconceivable, given the atmosphere of totalitarian isolation and ignorance in Moscow, that the Soviet people, and even certain Soviet leaders, may at times consider - sincerely consider - that they are threatened by the West. One of the great tasks in the next few years in diplomacy is to try somehow to bridge this gap in misunderstanding, to build what His Holiness the Pope recently so aptly described as 'a bridge of truth' between east and west. . . ."

* * * *

CITIZENSHIP DAY: The Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Mr. J. W. Pickersgill, announced recently that the Government has decided that Citizenship Day in 1955 would be observed on Friday, May 20, which is the school day immediately preceding Victoria Day.

* * * *

The 80 firms in Canada's agricultural implements industry shipped \$171,269,525 worth of products in 1953, a drop of 16.8% from the 1952 output value of \$205,775,487, according to the annual report by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics.