

*North Atlantic Treaty*

ciples of the United Nations charter, their desire to live in peace with all peoples, settle their disputes by peaceful means, unite their efforts for collective defence, develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack on any of the signatories in Europe or North America, and if such an armed attack occurs, to take necessary action, including the use of armed force.

Clearly the proposed pact, which is unfortunately only regional in scope, since a plan of universal co-operation has failed through no fault of our own, is a determined effort to seek and maintain peace in our time; but bluntly, the pact also means war if an armed attack occurs against any signatory. We cannot, in good faith, sign the proposed treaty, unless we are fully prepared to honour our signature in peace and in war. It is well that our people as well as our potential enemies be amply warned of this last alternative, so that no one may ignore the responsibilities, guarantees, rights and dangers therein contained. We shall gain in prestige and respect both at home and abroad if our foreign policies, instead of being laid in secrecy, sentiment or political advantage, are based upon easily ascertainable and avowable moral and Christian concepts which all men of good faith will clearly understand.

In listening to the Right Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent), the distinguished Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Drew), and the leaders of the other parties in the house give their explanations of this proposed North Atlantic pact, I could not help but reflect on the relentless march and evolution of Canada's foreign policies during the course of the last fifty years, and the tremendous responsibilities and obligations accruing therefrom. This evolution has not come without friction, conflicts, deep resentment and marked divergences of opinion. Our geographical and economic tensions, the different racial origins, traditions and culture of our two major groups, particularly the head-on collision of a rising nationalism with an obstinate colonialism, the slow but enduring Americanization of many Canadians, particularly of the younger generation, through the persistent influence of United States movies, literature, radio, business intercourse and methods, have all contributed to the shaping or rather the reshaping of our attitude toward international problems. Too many stupidities and unfounded accusations have been uttered by theorists and self-styled directors of the national conscience concerning isolationism and international organizations. The wheat must be separated from the chaff. We can have no other foreign policy which will be acceptable to all racial groups than one based upon the autonomy and

sovereignty of Canada; because without sovereignty there can be no true international law. What liberty is to the individual, autonomy and sovereignty are to a nation: a divine and fundamental right. But it carries with it the corresponding duty to reconcile sovereignty with the right to collective peace and progress in international society. Through sovereignty a nation decides freely upon its form of government; signs or abstains from signing treaties, alliances and pacts; declares and wages war; proclaims and enforces its neutrality; organizes efficient defence of its territory. Here again, however, there necessarily arises the duty of every nation, big or small, either alone or through pacts and alliances with other sovereign nations, to vigilantly safeguard, even at the price of war, the sovereign autonomous action of its chosen government.

Viewed thus, it is not isolationism for one to proclaim the autonomy and sovereignty of his country, but intelligent and reasoned patriotism. And if the absolute and atheistic dictators of Russia today had this conception of autonomy and sovereignty there would be no necessity, much less urgency, for a North Atlantic regional pact. However, because these saboteurs of international peace and friendliness acknowledge no obligation to either God or man and persist in their belief that the outside world is hostile and should be overthrown, no one must be led astray by the broad principle of sovereignty, nor distort its true meaning in the present world crisis. Let us not for a single moment forget that today sovereignty is not only invoked by the righteous nations who are weak, but by the powerful who are wrong, much as in the fable of the lamb and the wolf. I have no hesitation in asserting that each and every Canadian, whether of English or French or other racial descent, in my constituency and indeed in the whole province of Quebec, is anxious and willing to sacrifice to international sovereignty that portion of the national sovereignty which may appear necessary or useful not only to establish the reign and respect of righteousness but to secure it permanently by power with justice.

Apart from the considerations I have just mentioned, Mr. Speaker, there is another stark reality which is inescapable. After total effort in two world wars, at the cost of thousands upon thousands of precious human lives and a national debt which runs to almost astronomical figures, Canada has greatly increased its international stature. With the radical redistribution of world power brought by the late war, our country has become a strong middle power, with commensurate obligations and responsibilities. Through our allegiance to a common crown,