

*North Atlantic Treaty*

This article quotes the President's statement as follows:

The primary purpose of these agreements is to provide an unmistakable proof of the joint determination of free countries to resist armed attack from any quarter . . . If we can make it sufficiently clear in advance that any armed attack affecting our national security would be met with overwhelming force, armed attack might never occur.

The article continues as follows:

Too much has been made of the constitutional difficulties which prevent definite American assurances of military help. In essence, they are not uniquely American, but are common to all democratic sovereign nations. This difficulty will only disappear with the establishment of a well-organized world security system in which an international police force functions as do the police now in a single civilized state. What matters for the present is that the United States is committed to Europe, and from a long-term viewpoint. That America became involved in so short a time, despite deep traditions of isolationism, is one of the most startling things in contemporary history. It happened largely thanks to Russian policy, though this was far from Russia's intention. It is also Russian policy that has compelled socialists reluctantly to accept the need for a degree of rearming and a military alignment with the United States.

As a matter of fact, this quotation summarizes also the main reason why the C.C.F. in Canada is giving its support to our country's participation in the conference to consider proposals for a North Atlantic defence treaty. I hope and believe that when the treaty comes before us, we shall be able to support its ratification.

We emphasize that the treaty is, in large measure, a defensive instrument made necessary by the failure of the security council to give the protection against aggression which we had the right to expect. The regional pact imposes upon the nations entering into the agreement the obligation of supporting every move in the direction of universal instead of regional security. The preamble of the proposed treaty makes that abundantly clear. We must bear in mind that in some ways more important than the military aspects of the treaty are those which obligate the nations to promote the economic well-being of their own countries and of the world.

The proposed treaty, in article 2, pledges the parties to contribute toward the further development of peaceful and friendly international relations by strengthening their free institutions, by bringing about a better understanding of the principles upon which these institutions are founded, and by promoting conditions of stability and well-being. They pledge themselves to try to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies and to encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them. Indeed, in the opinion of the C.C.F., as it was of those who formulated the United Nations charter, plans for military aid and security are of little value

[Mr. Coldwell.]

unless based upon a determination to build by mutual agreement the positive social and economic conditions of peace which involve wide measures of international planning for the common good.

Every proposal to increase and distribute food supplies and other necessities of life is a proposal to remove the causes of discontent which, in turn, cause men to grasp the promises of dictators whether they are of the fascist or of the communist variety. It was out of unbearable conditions of poverty, unemployment and want, that Mussolini and Hitler arose after the last war. It is because of intolerable conditions in Italy, Greece and elsewhere, that communist propaganda has been able to make such headway in those countries. In Britain, Norway and Denmark, for example, where farsighted social and economic policies have already been put into effect, communist propaganda is so weak that it is almost nonexistent.

I wish to emphasize, then, that while the reasons for the security pact for military co-operation have been made necessary by threats of aggression, the future of peace depends equally, perhaps more, upon the determination of the nations in the North Atlantic security pact to assist in economic and social development in their respective countries and to help each other in that regard. Indeed, economic co-operation among the democratic nations has preceded, not followed, the military proposals embodied in the proposed treaty. As soon as the war ended, the United Kingdom depleted her food reserves to feed the people in the liberated countries. The United States, Canada and other parts of the British commonwealth sent enormous quantities of food, raw materials and machinery to Europe for distribution by UNRRA. For several years to come the recovery of western Europe will be made possible, as it has been during the past year, by the European recovery program in which North America and the other signatories to the proposed pact have already joined.

Thus, economic co-operation for the removal of the causes of discontent and of poverty, which are fruitful causes of war, has preceded the proposals for defence and security under the proposed treaty. Then, too, under the pact the use of armed force is not necessarily involved in meeting a situation which might threaten peace. A joint diplomatic protest, backed as it would be by overwhelming economic and military resources, might be sufficient. Indeed, we hope and believe it would be, because that is largely the purpose of the pact.

The treaty recognizes the sovereign right of each nation, through its own parliament, to