

North Atlantic Treaty

If Britain is unable to obtain the means with which to produce goods and services, it is a sure thing she will not be able to produce them. The question has got to be asked and answered by every Canadian and every American. Where is Britain going to get the goods if we do not provide them for her, bearing in mind that Britain, as I said in my speech on November 12, has lost nearly all foreign investments upon which she relied for the provision of those goods in world war II? It is the plainest kind of common sense. There is no passion mixed up in it at all; it is just common sense, but of fearful urgency.

Britain for at least one hundred years has been gradually broadening the basis of freedom in the British empire and commonwealth. The British North America Act was one of the first examples. Have our anti-aid to Britain enthusiasts forgotten that it was the British parliament that passed the British North America Act? No more perfect constitution exists on earth than the constitutions of Canada and Australia. They are both British constitutions, both guaranteed by Britain and the British empire.

Have our anti-aid to Britain enthusiasts forgotten that constitutions like those of Canada and Australia need adequate protection—and just think of Australia during world war II, with Japan threatening her—by a power strong enough to protect yet wise and noble enough to guarantee perpetuation of those liberties?

Canadians from Quebec and other provinces cherish with jealous vigilance their provincial sovereignty, and rightly so. They prize their liberty to speak their own language, and rightly so. They would give their all at any moment to keep their privilege to worship almighty God according to the dictates of their conscience, and rightly so. They dread conscription with a violent passion, which is of course their right and which is strictly a British point of view, down through the hundreds of years. Have they forgotten that for over a century Britain has guaranteed them language and religious freedom?

Mr. Gauthier (Portneuf): We fought for it.

Mr. Blackmore: So did Britain.

Mr. Gauthier (Portneuf): We fought for our language.

Mr. Blackmore: Yes, of course you did, and Britain fought for it many times; do not forget that.

Mr. Gauthier (Portneuf): We do not forget anything.

Mr. Blackmore: And by the British North America Act, the Balfour declaration and the statute of Westminster, Britain has guaranteed their provincial sovereignty both by declaration and solemn enactment.

Have they failed to take note how lightly NATO delegates talk about setting up an over-all agency with authority to modify the sovereignty not only of provinces such as Quebec but of nations such as Canada? In other words, do they realize that what men are talking about at NATO conferences is taking away sovereignty from all the nations that join that organization? Have the implications of all of this been utterly lost upon these Canadians? Is it not clear that the only alternative to NATO would be a British commonwealth, powerful as that commonwealth might be? A British commonwealth, no matter how powerful it might become, would guarantee the absolute sovereignty of every member and every part of that commonwealth.

I wonder if these anti-aid to Britain Canadians have given thought to what might happen to the freedom of some Canadians to worship as they please if Russia laid her unholy hands upon Rome, a thing which I understand Russia longs passionately to do. What is their surest safeguard against such a contingency if it is not a powerful Britain and a powerful British commonwealth?

Have certain Canadians considered what might happen to their language liberties if a certain nation enclosed them in its almost covetous embrace? A revitalized British commonwealth offers the most potent security against such a development.

Have the anti-conscription Canadians contemplated what possible chance they would have of keeping their sons from conscription if a NATO such as is being dreamed of was brought into being?

In my speech of November 12 I indicated how much it would mean economically to Canada if she provided Britain with enough Canadian dollars to buy surplus Canadian production. Have the anti-aid to Britain debaters overlooked those remarks of mine which may be found on page 921 of *Hansard*? I defy anyone to question the validity of that statement, either in this house or out. May I suggest that they take a second look at the results to Canadian producers of commodities such as eggs, cheese, pork, fruits, syrup, dried milk that would flow from a liberal Canadian policy of credit toward Great Britain. All they have to do is look back to world war II. As I pointed out on November 12, we had the thing exemplified then.

There will be those who will say, "Oh, well, Uncle Sam will advance dollars to Britain