

NATO—European Defence Community

adventure, and it will be worse the next time; but we are doing our best, and for goodness sake do not let us face both ways.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. If the minister speaks now, he will close the debate.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I think all hon. members will agree we have had a good discussion which is worthy of the importance of this matter. I have a few words to say in concluding the discussion because I think the house would expect me to try to deal with some of the points that have been raised.

In the first place, Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer to one or two specific points raised by the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Pearkes). He wanted to know what the position of Turkey would be under these NATO guarantees and the European defence community guarantee. He was worried about the use of the word "Europe" in the article of the protocol referring to that guarantee. If he had read a little further in that article he would have seen that the guarantee extends to the territory of any of the members of the European defence community in Europe or any area described in article 6(1) of the North Atlantic treaty. That reciprocal guarantee is also in the European defence community treaty.

If he were then to turn to article 6(1) of the North Atlantic treaty, an article which was modified by the admission of Turkey and Greece, he would discover a guarantee in that treaty which now extends to the territory of any of the parties in Europe or North America, to the Algerian departments of France and to the territory of Turkey. Those words were added when Turkey joined the North Atlantic pact, so it is quite clear the guarantee we extend to those countries extends to their whole metropolitan area. The reason the word "Europe" was used in the first place was to exclude from the guarantee the colonial territories of some of the signatory powers.

Then the hon. member wanted to know what the situation was in regard to Berlin, and that is a very important point. I do not think I mentioned this morning that Berlin is not included in the territory covered by the peace contract. There are references, however, to Berlin in the contract and in certain supplementary exchanges which will be found attached to the contract. The interest of the three western powers in Berlin was affirmed in September, 1950, in a tripartite security guarantee which they gave at that time. This guarantee was later reaffirmed at a North Atlantic council meeting, and again on the signature of the European defence

[Mr. Macdonnell (Greenwood).]

community treaty in Paris on May 27, in the following terms:

They—

That is the three governments.

—therefore reaffirm that they will treat any attack against Berlin from any quarter as an attack upon their forces and themselves.

I believe it is quite clear now that any attack on Berlin from any quarter would call into effect the guarantee so far as the three main guarantors are concerned; that is recognized in the exchanges that have recently taken place.

Mr. Low: Is the guarantee limited to the three?

Mr. Pearson: We have accepted ours, of course, under the original treaty. The effect of an attack on the occupying powers in Germany, including Berlin, would be an attack on those powers, so we are included to that extent.

Mr. Graydon: It is not affected by this legislation now?

Mr. Pearson: Any obligation we may have in respect of Berlin, Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, is not affected by this particular peace contract.

Mr. Graydon: Only by the original guarantee.

Mr. Pearson: By the original guarantee, and by our association with the tripartite declaration of 1950.

One other point was raised by the hon. member for Nanaimo. He called my attention to the fact that I had given the impression that the German contingent of the European defence forces would be allowed to use defensive armaments only. If I gave that impression it was wrong because, as he pointed out, the defensive use of weapons is one thing but a defensive weapon is another. The German contingent with the European defence forces, if and when they are constituted, would of course be armed with the same weapons as the other contingents of that army.

If I may revert to some of the more general observations that were made, I should like to say a word first about the very interesting and constructive statement of the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Graydon). He made a plea, which was echoed by other speakers, that we should tell the people what we are doing in connection with foreign affairs, a plea which he has made before in this house and one to which no hon. member would wish to take exception. I agree that we should tell the people what we are doing in matters of this kind which are so important to them and to their destiny. I believe that, by and large,