

*External Affairs*

help. Growing sums of money are being spent on weapons, but surely we should learn the lesson of history that when we spend more money on weapons our possible antagonists also are going to spend more. The eventual result must be growing fear, growing tension, and the distinct possibility of war.

Today almost everything is being placed second to the illusion of national security. In the North Atlantic pact we are trying to provide ourselves with security, but again we have not gone far enough. Here Canada has a grave responsibility, because the government, rightly and properly, insisted on the insertion of article 2 in that treaty. That is the article which deals with closer economic collaboration. Unless we can get rid of the economic rivalry and economic war which now exists, we are not going to find the security we want in military co-operation. We must have economic as well as military co-operation; then there may be for us an element of safety. I believe it is the responsibility of the government to press that view not only in private but also, if necessary, in public.

So far as I am concerned, I firmly believe that it is national sovereignty that is keeping the world in a turmoil. Until we get rid of national sovereignty, I see no hope of ultimate security. We have learned a lesson in surrendering some of our own individual rights in our communities. Each of us has been required to give up some part of his individual sovereignty to the community, so that it could maintain law and order. In that way, security and freedom have been maintained. We have not yet had the intelligence to project that lesson into the field of international affairs. Until we have seized

the initiative, and attempted to catch the imagination of the people of the world, we shall not succeed in containing communism. The suggestion I have to make may be greeted with a certain amount of derision in some quarters, but I do think we could seize the initiative by suggesting at the United Nations that an element of national sovereignty be surrendered to that collective body. This element of national sovereignty would, of course, deal with national defence.

I do not think for a moment that the offer would be accepted by the Russians or by their satellites, but at least we would have made the offer. If that does not work, then we have to try to achieve something within a narrower group. The only group I can see is that composed of our allies in the North Atlantic treaty. If we do that, if we collectively give up part of our sovereignty then I can see hope. I believe this government has to give leadership, not only to the people of Canada, but as we can and as we must do, to the people of the world.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the motion?

**Mr. Hansell:** No, Mr. Speaker, I would beg leave to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

**BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE**

**Mr. Fournier (Hull)** moved the adjournment of the house.

He said: Tomorrow we shall resume the debate on the address.

Motion agreed to and the house adjourned at 10.50 p.m.