



STATEMENTS AND SPEECHES

INFORMATION DIVISION
DEPARTMENT OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS
OTTAWA - CANADA

No. 61/12

CANADA IN A WORLD IN CRISIS

The following address was made to the House of Commons in Committee of Supply, on September 11, 1961, by Prime Minister Diefenbaker

...The thanks of the Committee are due to all Hon. Members for the way in which they dealt with this very important question not only of West Berlin but of the world situation generally and the several things referred to by the Secretary of State for External Affairs in outlining matters for the consideration of the Committee. I am not going into the field of defence today, or of measures that are being taken for national survival. These will be dealt with when the departmental estimates in which these matters are dealt with come before the Committee. I want to say further in that connection that I appreciate the co-operation of the Opposition and the attitude taken by all members of the Opposition in permitting the motion for supply to go through this morning without debate in order to ensure that there would be no delay in the discussion of those questions of national and international importance that face us today.

I thank the Leader of the Opposition for the contribution he made in answering some myths that have achieved widespread circulation during recent weeks. One of them is that Berlin is a crisis that propaganda built, a view expressed by one or more journalists or pundits in various parts of Canada. The other is that Canadians are the victims of propaganda to make them believe there is a crisis over Berlin. The Leader of the Opposition dealt effectively with those who hold that view...

The Leader of the Opposition made some reference to a speech I made recently before the Canadian Bar Association, and gave general approval thereto. I can only say that this is one time I most heartily reciprocate the words he used, when he stated that he thought I struck the right note. In order to keep in harmony with that attitude, I say of him as he said of me that in his speech in the House the other day I thought he struck the right note.

While differences are bound to occur between Government and Opposition, differences which are a vital necessity of democratic government, there does come a time when issues transcend political considerations, and this is one of those times. All of us have as our purpose and our aim

the maintenance and the preservation of peace. Those of us who have responsibilities would like to do that which we are often asked to do, go into detail in regard to matters, when if we did that the result would be to deny that freedom of consultation which is of the essence of the relationship that must prevail among the free nations.

What is Owed to NATO

My opinion, and I think the attitude of the House, has been that this is an hour which demands moral strength and courage. Panic is the refuge of weakness. Confidence can be a weapon of peace. Communism breeds on fear and weakness. When I hear criticism of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization I sometimes wonder whether those who criticize realize that if it had not been for the defensive strength of NATO we might very well not be here today. That is how important NATO has been as a defensive organization, and how necessary it is today.

The ideals of democracy and peace in my opinion can best be served at this hour by showing the Kremlin that we will not sit back and allow the world in which we believe to be swept aside by the acceptance of those things that deny every principle of freedom for which we stand. We must at the same time speak words of measured carefulness so that nothing will be said which will add to the fires which today are burning.

...In the past two days, the House has maintained that principle, that each and all of us have to speak and must speak our views. That is the essence of democracy. Some of us will have to go back on some of the views that we have expressed in the past. That is of the essence of democracy too. Though I do not often do so, I speak now of a colleague, the Secretary of State for External Affairs, and of the contribution he has made since assuming that office, a contribution outstanding and worthy of the sacrifice made by those of his generation who served with him in the First War. He believed in the United Nations, and in the United Nations and outside he built a structure of peace with disarmament. He carried the fight in the United Nations and at Geneva. That is why his speech the other day to me carried the conviction that comes from one who is speaking with the experience that he has had.

No Retreat from Idealism

I see that some say he retreated. There is no retreat when one acknowledges that the idealism that he has expressed has not been accepted, and has been interpreted by the Kremlin and those associated with the Kremlin as a sign of weakness rather than of greatness. Some say he is too idealistic. Idealism has its place..., and if the free world sacrifices its idealism to godless materialism there will be little to choose between Communism and democracy in 50 years, whatever the result may be of the world contest. With all his heart, with all his devotion to the principle of disarmament, and with all his hopefulness that the clouds on the international horizon would be dissipated, in the light of recognition of the terrible danger of a nuclear war he told the House that we in the free world were on the threshold of potential world disaster.

That causes us to re-examine some of the principles of Canada's foreign policy which, in the light of the discussions that have taken place during this debate, indicate an area of agreement between the Government and the Opposition, with the Opposition having at all times not only the right but the duty to point out, while agreeing with the objectives, what changes should be made that would be beneficial.

Canada's Foreign Policy

Canada's foreign policy can be summed up in three short paragraphs: First, continuing support for a strong and effective United Nations without which peace cannot be achieved, while recognizing that changes in the Charter ought to be made in the light of the experience since 1945. Second, the need of a strong and effective North Atlantic Treaty Organization, with which I will deal later. Finally, and I speak now for the Government in this regard, we believe in the extension and development of a strong Commonwealth of Nations, believing that no other association throughout the world has a greater influence for good. Indeed, the adherence by its members to its principles, though unwritten, denies the acceptance of Communism.

The position we are in today, and when I say this I speak of the attitude of some Canadians and others, is brought about as a result of the process of confusion and propaganda which is of the essence of Communist philosophy. The Communists deceive people into believing that the existing crisis was created by other nations.

Khrushchov Crisis Creator

There is no disagreement between the Government and the Opposition that the crisis was created by Khrushchov for his own purposes, just as he has created crises throughout the years. If it is not Korea it is Vietnam. If it is not Vietnam it is Berlin, and so on. There is no crisis of our making in East Berlin. We have not stirred up any crisis. Some say to me: "How can Canada consider doing anything else but bending the knee to Khrushchov over a paltry city of 2.5 million?" I quite understand the sentimental and emotional plea behind that. The sacrifice of 100,000 Canadians cannot but bring that emotional reaction if the broader situation is not examined.

This is a larger question than West Berlin, a greater problem than its people. There is the pledged word of the Western nations that the people of West Berlin will not be sacrificed, their freedom will not be destroyed; that the rights of access into West Berlin shall not be discontinued. Berlin has become the tangible symbol of a global difference between Communism and the forces of freedom. The U.S.S.R. would endeavour to restrict the problem to a divided Berlin. Berlin is more than an isolated outpost. Khrushchov knows that he has already sealed off ingress and egress to West Berlin from East Berlin. He has done that because he realized that the outcome in connection with Berlin will determine, in a considerable measure, the future of freedom everywhere in the world.

When one walks in the streets of West Berlin it is difficult to realize that to thinking people everywhere in the world this small island, as it were, surrounded by Communism, represents to the free world, as it represents to the Communist world, the axis of the struggle as between Communism and freedom. It is not a question of the reunification of Germany, as was mentioned here this morning. We are not dealing with that question. We are dealing with the pledged word of the free world. If we ever get the reputation amongst the uncommitted nations of the world that are standing with us that our word, under seal, means no more than a passing fancy, then indeed will Khrushchov have won the greatest victory Communism has ever achieved.

Motives of Khrushchov

One has to follow the course he has taken since the adjournment of the House, and it has been an interesting course. From time to time he has spoken the soft, sweet words of peace. These were followed by threats as to what would happen. One moment he is the smiling Khrushchov; the next moment he is engaged in his terror campaign. It is difficult to understand why he chose a time just before the Belgrade Conference opened to announce the resumption of his nuclear testing programme. Perhaps his purpose was to make the neutrals fearful that if they were critical of the U.S.S.R. they would be in danger. Why did he take that course? Well, he must have been preparing for some time because we were told today, I believe, that the fifth and sixth atomic explosions had occurred. Is he about to announce the production of an anti-missile missile following a short period of testing?

It is interesting to note that some of those who speak the loudest regarding the stand of Canada and the free world have been so silent in their condemnation of Khrushchov and the stand he has taken followed by his action regarding nuclear testing. He has placed the lives of people everywhere in the world in jeopardy. He has done so cynically. He said his purpose was, in effect, to let the people of the world realize their position and their danger. I find it difficult to understand, as did the Secretary of State for External Affairs, why the Belgrade Conference did not make some outstanding declarations on this subject. I find it difficult to understand how they reacted so tepidly to Khrushchov's gross contempt of human safety.

U.S. Test Resumption

The United States is now proceeding with testing. I have my own views in this regard. I can only say one thing. I hope that no action will be taken by any government belonging to the NATO organization without consultation in advance of that action. I realize that, as the Secretary of State for External Affairs has pointed out, they could take no other course. It is not for me to say that one would have hoped that having delayed for three years during the moratorium, a delay of the same number of weeks might have been helpful in the mobilization of world opinion.

What is Khrushchov's attitude? I am often told that if we could only try and be reasonable, how different things would be. Was there anything unreasonable in the request made by the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom and the President of the United States that there be no

testing in the atmosphere? Testing in the atmosphere, the cause of the deleterious nature of fall-out, should have been the last thing undertaken. There could have been tests underground. Mr. Khrushchov declared on Saturday that nuclear testing could be ended only by Western acceptance of Soviet proposals for a German peace treaty and complete disarmament. What association is there between nuclear testing and a German peace treaty?

For the last year and a half, the Secretary of State for External Affairs has been doing everything possible, as I said a moment ago, to bring about international agreement on disarmament. The Leader of the Opposition pointed out there were 300 or so meetings held in Geneva. There was hope. I remember the last time I talked to Prime Minister Macmillan. He said, "I think we are going to secure a continuing moratorium and indeed an agreement on testing." If we had been able to achieve that, we would have gone a long way, because we would have established that in this narrow field, inspection and control would operate in an experimental stage as a preparation for the larger field of disarmament whenever disarmament comes.

Mr. Khrushchov called on the United States and Great Britain to meet in settling the main problems of our times, general and complete disarmament. He said, "Let us seek seriously, in good faith, a solution of the question of concluding a German peace treaty so as to arrest in good time the sliding of states into the inferno of a rocket nuclear war". In other words, "I believe in negotiation", says Mr. Khrushchov. He says, "I will keep what I have and then I will take what you have or part of it". That is not the principle of negotiation.

Communist Programme

What has his attitude been since last July, when the House last met? He has been moving to higher and more aggressive peaks of threat and intimidation week by week. It is very interesting to read the Communist manifesto. I am not going into details with regard thereto, but I suggest to Hon. Members that they read the text of the Soviet Party's draft programme for the next 20 years. Hitler took 1,000 pages in "Mein Kampf". Khrushchov takes less than 50 pages, and he places before the world the blueprint of the architect, in which he builds a house for all mankind, with the U.S.S.R. having the only key to the premises.

It is well to read what he says. It reveals the cold ruthlessness that is apparent in the breaking of his nation's word by the resumption of tests. Today one...Member said this is not a contest between capitalism and socialism. I immediately rise to say that in so far as Communism is concerned it would bring about all its changes by revolution, infiltration and the destruction of the will to resist. This is what the Soviet Party's draft programme says:

The great October socialist revolution ushered in a new era in the history of mankind, the era of the downfall of capitalism and the establishment of Communism. Socialism has triumphed in the Soviet Union and has achieved decisive victories in the people's democracies; socialism has become a cause of practical

significance to hundreds of millions of people, and the bearer of the revolutionary movement of the working class throughout the world."

Then it goes on to say:

"The socialist revolution in European and Asian countries has resulted in the establishment of the world socialist system. A powerful wave of national liberation revolutions is sweeping away the colonial system of imperialism."

One does not have to sort out these passages:

"The victorious workers and peasants lacked knowledge of state administration and the experience necessary for the construction of a new society. The difficulties of socialist construction were greatly increased by the fact that for almost 30 years the U.S.S.R. was the world's only socialist state and was subjected to incisive attacks by the hostile capitalist environment."

Then it says again:

"Socialism has done away forever with the supremacy of private ownership of the means of production, that source of the division of society into antagonistic classes. Socialist ownership of the means of production has become the solid economic foundation of society. Unlimited opportunities have been afforded for the development of the productive forces."

Then it also says:

"Under the leadership of Lenin it worked out a plan for the radical transformation of the country, for the construction of socialism. On the basis of a thorough scientific analysis, Lenin elaborated the policy of the proletarian state for the entire period of transition from capitalism to socialism. He evolved the new economic policy...designed to bring about the victory of socialism."

And so Khrushchov goes on. He says that within this generation the Kremlin will have succeeded everywhere in the world in bringing about the changes that are set out in that manifesto. He also indicates that coexistence means the acceptance by the free world of the will of the Communist world.

I think all of us are agreed as to the seriousness of the events of recent days. What should be done? There have been a number of suggestions made, all of them helpful... I am...going to say something regarding the possibility of the United Nations having a larger place in an endeavour to bring about a settlement of this problem.

What UN Can Do

There are some things the United Nations can do; there are others it cannot do. The United Nations is limited by the fact that Berlin is part of the peace settlement with Germany and is, therefore, under the Charter, reserved for consideration by the victorious powers. However, if the four powers decide they would like the United Nations to play a part, then there are roles the United Nations can play. There is the question of safeguarding the maintenance of peace; and where the peace is threatened, if the majority of the United Nations decide that this is being done by the U.S.S.R. or by any other nation, the matter could be brought before the United Nations. Mr. Khrushchov said in his interview with Mr. Sulzberger of the New York Times that he is not averse to United Nations discussions if the Big Four agree.

Various suggestions have been made. One is that the whole of the city of Berlin could be placed under the trusteeship of the United Nations, with access guaranteed by a UN force. There have been suggestions that the United Nations should be moved from New York to Berlin. Speaking for myself, I may say that suggestion has no appeal...

I think the time has come when consideration might be given--and the United Nations might give consideration thereto--to the internationalizing of the city of Berlin under the United Nations, with its status to continue under United Nations presence. I realize that this suggestion would not receive the support of Mr. Khrushchov. However, it at least would bring about a step forward in the assurance that if negotiation failed, the United Nations would have something to which it could give its attention. It would require uncontrolled access by the West. It would also require a willingness on the part of the four powers to agree.

Moral Responsibility

Someone has said that matters like this should not be discussed in advance of election campaigns in other parts of the world. I believe this is a serious enough matter that it should be discussed, if only for the purpose of directing the attention of mankind to a possible solution before it becomes too late to do so. As I said in Winnipeg and now repeat, Canada being one of the smaller nations, a member of NATO and of NORAD, with its record of sacrifice it has a right and a responsibility to place its views before mankind. After all, if the decision is left to four nations, without any suggestions having come from the smaller nations, the moral responsibility will rest on the governments of the smaller nations for having failed to advance their views.

There is one thing I wish to point out. I read that one of the pundits said that in the course of my Winnipeg speech I had not revealed the points which would be subject to negotiation. I can only say that I have never known any success to be attained by revealing in advance of negotiations the stand you are going to take. However, that does not mean that the stand should not have been determined upon. That does not imply either that the Government of Canada, in its desire for peace, has not made a number of important suggestions which, in the perspective of the future, can be revealed.

The possibility of developing a role for the United Nations as a means of achieving a solution to the Berlin problem must necessarily be carefully examined. In the past the United Nations has made notable contributions to the peaceful settlement of disputes.

For the Record

In point of fact the potentialities of the United Nations in this connection have not been ignored. This suggestion on my part regarding the United Nations is not new. I would point out that on March 19, 1959, in answer to a question by the Leader of the Opposition in which he inquired of me whether I would give a report about the conversations that had just been completed with the Prime Minister and the Foreign Secretary of the United Kingdom...I stated as follows:

"Our talks were largely in the nature of an exchange of information and a review of the German and Berlin problems and of the various proposals for a settlement of those problems now under study in Western capitals and in NATO. I should emphasize that neither Mr. Macmillan nor I attempted to crystallize any British or Canadian position on specific questions under discussion. However, I might add that it is my belief that the United Nations might play some significant role in the solution of the Berlin problem, and that this phase deserves further and more careful study. I think it would be generally agreed that it was clear there was no essential difference in the British and Canadian assessments of the world situation or in the basic aims and policies of our two countries with regard to the complex questions of Germany, Berlin and European security.

I do not think I can add anything more to what I have said. I know the Leader of the Opposition, with his great experience in these matters, will realize that I can go no further than the outline I have just given the House."

At that time the Leader of the Opposition said this:

"It is particularly gratifying to hear the Prime Minister say that there may be a way in which the United Nations can, in due course, play a part in this Berlin situation in a manner which would be helpful to peace and security."

Then, speaking in the House on April 7, 1969...these words:

"By way of contributing to this process of clarification Canada offered a few suggestions concerning the problem of Berlin."

That reference is to clarification of the joint NATO viewpoint arising from the NATO Ministerial Meeting, which was then taking place in Washington and at which the then Minister of National Defence, Hon. George Pearkes, V.C., represented Canada. I continued:

"In the Canadian view no agreement can be acceptable to the West which places in jeopardy the security of West Berlin or the freedom of its citizens."

That view was expressed two and a half years ago. I continued:

"It is also the Canadian view that the NATO countries could not accept a solution which might endanger the ties between the Federal Republic of Germany and the other countries of Western Europe."

Since then from time to time representations have been made. Indeed, I might return to the words of General Pearkes when, reporting on the conference on April 8, 1959, he said this...:

"It is unnecessary for me to elaborate on what the Prime Minister has said, though I would call attention to the statement he made about the suggestion which was advanced by the Canadian Delegation that in some manner the United Nations might be able to assist in the solution of the Berlin problem."

Later he stated:

"Further study has been given to the possibility of the United Nations playing some part, and suggestions were made at the meeting as to how the United Nations might contribute something to the solution of the problem. I pointed out that we in Canada were anxious that consideration be given to ways by which the present arrangements over Berlin could be strengthened, either by supplementary or substitute arrangements. I pointed out that the Prime Minister had made his statement as of March 19, and then I went on to say that I would doubt if the United Nations could play a useful part unless a four-power agreement had first been reached. I suggested that a settlement involving the United Nations need not be weaker, and conceivably might be more stable, than the present position in which the powers are now in Berlin by right of conquest. Although the effective introduction of the United Nations into the Berlin situation could probably be accomplished only through the agreement of the four powers, it could serve to engage the interest of other governments in the freedom and independence of Berlin in a way which no agreement reached solely among the occupying powers could do. Accordingly I suggested it would be worth while for the permanent council to study the possibilities of a role for the United Nations in the application of a solution to the Berlin problem, and an assurance was given that a full study would be made by the permanent council of the suggestions which were put forward."

I would also point out that there was an occasion when the United Nations did endeavour to be of some assistance in connection with Berlin, but it was not very successful. That had to do with the Committee of the United Nations which was set up some 10 years ago.

On September 1, I stated: "The Charter of the United Nations declares the primary purpose of the United Nations to be the maintenance of international peace and security. It must be ready to make use of the United Nations". ...There are a number of complicating factors, not the least of which is the question of the timing of any United Nations involvement.

The UN in Berlin

The United Nations could, to begin with, exercise the function of promoter of an agreement on the Berlin problem by providing a focus for world opinion, which could have the effect of impelling the powers directly concerned to settle their differences by negotiation. Second, the United Nations could, if the powers concerned could be persuaded to agree, act in various roles as observer to verify that any new agreement reached was being fully implemented in accordance with its provision. Third, the United Nations could be assigned the more difficult task of operating an international regime in Berlin.

The problem is one of selecting the role which is most likely to contribute to the settlement of the Berlin problem in particular circumstances. This means essentially that the role of the United Nations must be related to developments in negotiations toward a settlement. The four powers have primary responsibility in Berlin, and must first enter into direct negotiations. There are some indications at the moment that there is a reasonable prospect of there being negotiations. When I speak of a reasonable prospect, I am not speaking in anticipation of possible success, in view of Mr. Khrushchov's intrinsic position. If direct negotiations succeed might there be a possibility of providing a role for the United Nations, perhaps as guarantor of the agreement reached?

It is important to remember that the effective introduction of the United Nations into Berlin could only be done by agreement of all the four powers. I need not say that this may not be easily achieved. Whatever the difficulty might be, I think the little powers and other nations to be affected by the outcome of the Berlin problem have a right to an opportunity to be heard and to place their views clearly before a forum of most of the nations on earth. Furthermore, I can think of the possibility of the United Nations role being that of an observer in the city, or a supervisor on the access routes. Consideration of this possibility might facilitate negotiations and, if the idea were implemented, it might provide a stabilizing element in what is bound to remain a sensitive area throughout the years...

Belgrade Declarations

Over and over again we listen to Khrushchov babbling about imperialism and colonialism, picturing himself, the leader of Communism, as the exponent of freedom for peoples who are under domination. The Belgrade Conference made a number of recommendations and suggestions, among which are the following:

I would also point out that there was an occasion when the United Nations did endeavour to be of some assistance in connection with Berlin, but it was not very successful. That had to do with the Committee of the United Nations which was set up some 10 years ago.

On September 1, I stated: "The Charter of the United Nations declares the primary purpose of the United Nations to be the maintenance of international peace and security. It must be ready to make use of the United Nations". ...There are a number of complicating factors, not the least of which is the question of the timing of any United Nations involvement.

The UN in Berlin

The United Nations could, to begin with, exercise the function of promoter of an agreement on the Berlin problem by providing a focus for world opinion, which could have the effect of impelling the powers directly concerned to settle their differences by negotiation. Second, the United Nations could, if the powers concerned could be persuaded to agree, act in various roles as observer to verify that any new agreement reached was being fully implemented in accordance with its provision. Third, the United Nations could be assigned the more difficult task of operating an international regime in Berlin.

The problem is one of selecting the role which is most likely to contribute to the settlement of the Berlin problem in particular circumstances. This means essentially that the role of the United Nations must be related to developments in negotiations toward a settlement. The four powers have primary responsibility in Berlin, and must first enter into direct negotiations. There are some indications at the moment that there is a reasonable prospect of there being negotiations. When I speak of a reasonable prospect, I am not speaking in anticipation of possible success, in view of Mr. Khrushchov's intrinsic position. If direct negotiations succeed might there be a possibility of providing a role for the United Nations, perhaps as guarantor of the agreement reached?

It is important to remember that the effective introduction of the United Nations into Berlin could only be done by agreement of all the four powers. I need not say that this may not be easily achieved. Whatever the difficulty might be, I think the little powers and other nations to be affected by the outcome of the Berlin problem have a right to an opportunity to be heard and to place their views clearly before a forum of most of the nations on earth. Furthermore, I can think of the possibility of the United Nations role being that of an observer in the city, or a supervisor on the access routes. Consideration of this possibility might facilitate negotiations and, if the idea were implemented, it might provide a stabilizing element in what is bound to remain a sensitive area throughout the years...

Belgrade Declarations

Over and over again we listen to Khrushchov babbling about imperialism and colonialism, picturing himself, the leader of Communism, as the exponent of freedom for peoples who are under domination. The Belgrade Conference made a number of recommendations and suggestions, among which are the following:

"Imperialism is weakening. Colonial empires and other forms of foreign oppression of peoples in Asia, Africa and Latin America are gradually disappearing from the stage of history...In the same way, the peoples of Latin America are continuing to make an increasingly effective contribution to the improvement of international relations."

This article then continues as follows:

"All this accelerates the end of the epoch of foreign oppression of peoples, but also makes peaceful co-operation among peoples, based on the principles of independence and equal rights, an essential condition for their freedom and progress."

Further on in this article appears the following statement:

"The participants in the Conference solemnly reaffirm their support to the (declaration of the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples,) adopted at the fifteenth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, and recommend the immediate unconditional, total and final abolition of colonialism and imperialist domination in all its forms and manifestations."

A little later on they again reiterate this. I am surprised they do not include Eastern Europe.

I recognize that there are many who would say that is something which should not be dealt with. Mr. Khrushchov unilaterally wants to set aside agreements entered into with regard to Berlin which were part of a general settlement between the victorious and the vanquished. I should like to see the United Nations given an opportunity of declaring its opposition to the type of imperialism which he has placed upon one hundred million people not only in Eastern Europe but in other parts of the world.

When the Belgrade nations declared their belief in the right of peoples to self-determination and independence, and the free determination of the forms and methods of their economic, social and cultural development, I should like very much to have seen that declaration include the U.S.S.R. Why it was not included I have no idea. But there is a field in which I think we in the free world, in the United Nations, could place in proper perspective the arguments advanced by Khrushchov in this regard. Indeed I regard a stand such as this as one that would do much good, although I know there are others who say we must leave that alone. Why should the free world always be on the defensive? Unfortunately, because of our desire for peace, many of the things which ought to have been said have not been said. While we debate that stand in the interests of the maintenance of peace, Khrushchov continues to push forward inch by inch and mile by mile all over the world.

I am going to conclude by saying something about NATO. I think that by his threats and recriminations in the last few months, Mr. Khrushchov has done much to bring about greater unity in NATO than ever before. I pointed out earlier, as did the Leader of the Opposition, that the countries in NATO are equals and that there is need of full and complete consultation. I repeat what I said earlier. I hope that never again will one of the member nations of NATO act without consultation with the other members of NATO.

The Leader of the Opposition was one of the Committee of Three in 1956. At that time responsibility was given to that Committee to consider ways and means of putting principles about consultation into practice. That report, which still serves as a useful reference document on the problem of consultation, recognized the difficulties when it stated in Paragraph 17:

"North Atlantic political and economic co-operation, however, let alone unity, will not be brought about in a day or by a declaration, but by creating over the years and through a whole series of national acts and policies, the habits and traditions and precedents for such co-operation and unity. The process will be a slow and gradual one at best; slower than we might wish. We can be satisfied if it is steady and sure."

Then, in Paragraph 40 we find the following:

"One of those limitations is the hard fact that ultimate responsibility for decision and action still rests on national governments."

Importance of Consultation

The Canadian Government has consistently recognized the importance of consultation and the process of co-ordination in the alliance in the interests of greater unity. It has consistently urged that the alliance should adapt its machinery to changed circumstances and I have expressed the view that this can be accomplished within the existing framework of NATO. We believe that NATO's unity and strength derive from and will continue to derive in a large measure from a principle of equality of membership. Consequently we have opposed the formation of political blocs or directorates within the alliance which can only have the effect of weakening its unity and purpose by establishing some members in a preferred or dominant position in relation to the others.

When I was in Europe in November, 1958, I was able to make Canada's views clear to members of NATO at that time. It was almost simultaneous with the suggestion that a triumvirate should be set up. I said we would not accept it.

We have also urged that in its review of long-term planning NATO should review the principles of consultation with a view to better co-ordination of allied policies. Recognition was given to these principles at the last meeting of NATO foreign ministers in Oslo, attended by the

Secretary of State for External Affairs, for the first time, when agreement was reached on the main objectives which are to guide consultations and co-ordination of policies in NATO. The most important of these principles is "to achieve a common policy on subjects of direct concern to the alliance as a whole." Progress is being made. In these critical days the NATO Council is meeting regularly through its permanent representatives to fulfil its responsibilities but there is still room for improvement. I think I will say no more on that.

I think I ought to point out that while the Committee of which the Leader of the Opposition was a member made certain recommendations and some changes have taken place, as yet we have not arrived at that point where consultation is as complete as I would like to see it...

If we could only plan internationally to meet all of the changes of attitude and the circuitous courses followed by Mr. Khrushchov, things would be much simpler. The Leader of the Opposition asked whether there was any planning, any consultation regarding the sealing off, or any anticipation of the sealing off of ingress and egress between East Berlin and West Berlin. I frankly tell you I do not think that was anticipated. However--and I am answering him in this regard--there is planning and consultation to cover potential emergencies as they may arise with respect to Western rights and responsibilities in Berlin. I cannot, of course, disclose what action NATO governments propose to take if the Soviet Government or the East Germans attempt to block off access to Berlin. It would, however, be a mistake to imply that on this vital matter Western interests are dependent on improvisation at the time of or after the time of the event. The occupying powers, specifically the United States, the United Kingdom and France, have special responsibilities to ensure maintenance of access for their troops stationed in Berlin, and for their supplies. Under the North Atlantic Treaty and subsequent declarations of the NATO Council, all members have certain responsibilities in respect of Berlin.

The Leader of the Opposition implied that there might be a tendency to wait upon events improvidently before deciding on courses of action. I can tell the House that at the last NATO meeting in Oslo Canada took a leading part in urging the necessity of effective defence consultation on plans to meet contingencies which might arise in the Berlin situation. The United Kingdom, the United States and France are keeping the other members of NATO regularly informed of progress in their planning against various contingencies which are seen as possibly arising over Berlin, and the Government of Canada will continue to ensure that there is no slackening in the effectiveness of this consultation and planning.

This is no time for pessimism.... Equally it is not a time for optimism. Throughout the years all the free world has faced dire dangers. I remember in the fall of 1916 visiting the British House of Commons just prior to the change of administration and hearing the then Prime Minister, one of Britain's greatest, I think, the Right Hon. H.H. Asquith, say that they had passed through the gravest difficulties. A few weeks later I heard Lloyd George make his first speech as Prime Minister of the United Kingdom. I was one of seven Canadians who had that privilege. I might be asked how I happened to get into the gallery. As a matter of fact, Sir George Perley

was on the troop ship returning to his job as High Commissioner and he said that, if at any time in the future there was anything I wanted, I should get in touch with him. It was not many weeks before I did. I said, "I want a ticket to the gallery". He said, "That is a lot more difficult to secure than almost anything else you could ask for." I said, "That is what I want, that is what you promised me". I can tell you,...that is what I got.

I heard Lloyd George's speech and I have always remembered it. He had the power, the imagery and the command of language necessary for such an occasion. He compared the situation then to his boyhood days when he used to look toward the West with a mountain immediately in front of him. He wondered what was beyond that mountain so finally he climbed it and there was another mountain ahead. He said, "I knew that somewhere beyond there was hope for the world". I believe that today. I believe that if the free world will but stand firm, resolute and determined and at the same time not stubbornly unresilient to the necessities that are brought about through change, we shall come out of the Berlin problem stronger in the things of the spirit than ever before; for, as I see it, if we follow a course of defeatism by giving up our principles, we shall have laid the foundations for a future frightful to contemplate.

Communism does not understand any other principle than power. Communism does not believe in an immortal being who determines the course of mankind, even though sometimes taking generations to do so. We do, and if we do our part now without permitting ourselves to be intimidated I think there is a possibility that we shall be laying the foundations for a new relationship between the Communist world and the world of freedom, a relationship which cannot be hoped to be attained if we capitulate to the degree Khrushchov asks us to. If we give up our principles, what have we to live for in the years ahead?...

I know there are some who say that they think the things of the spirit should not be considered. We are right in the stand we are taking in this matter. It is not only a question of the people of West Berlin, although we gave our pledge there and must keep it. It is a question of whether we shall allow Khrushchov with intimidation and threats to push us back and back to a point where we have nothing but our past to look back on. If there is to be a future, if mankind is going forward to higher and better things, the things of the spirit are as important to nations as they are to individuals. It is in that spirit that I hope the free world will stand, prepared to make those changes which the realities demand but not prepared to sacrifice the principle in which we believe, the principle of the right of people to live under law even though the rule of law is not effective internationally.