

North Atlantic Treaty

We Social Crediters are not so concerned about the words and language of the pact as we are about what is interpreted to be the meaning or implications of its terms. We have noted that the pact is designed to be more than a mere defensive alliance. I think it was the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Pearson) who in his broadcast on Friday, March 18, spoke these words:

This is no mere negative proposal for a defence alliance. It is meant to be the beginning of a positive development in co-operation—economic, social, cultural—amongst the free nations of the Atlantic community.

May I spend just a few minutes on this matter of economic co-operation. Let me begin by quoting a striking statement recently made by a visitor to the United States from Denmark who was negotiating under the Marshall plan.

Danes know that, in a third world war, they will be completely destroyed. They look to America but often wonder if the inhabitants of America recognize that we live in an ideological age where food, weapons, and other material are not enough. We wonder if America has the real answer to communism. She has her un-American committees, her atom bombs, her money, but is America aware that communism is an ideology that can only be cured by a better idea? Does America have what is needed to convert communists into democrats? Mere anti-communism cannot be the way—only men who act like new men and live a new sort of life will have any chance to create a lasting peace.

I should like to paraphrase that statement in my own homely way: You cannot make the commies cry "uncle" if you have nothing better than an "anti".

Let me emphasize that by taking a look at the situation right here in Canada. I think most of us have a lot of blind spots in our eyes, especially in connection with this whole business of the war of ideologies. I think we are blind to the real nature and aims and strategy of communism. As one very clever writer has put it, "In this condition of blindness, we man the dikes, plug the leaks and curse the waves, but never think how we might turn the tide." I believe that our Canadian businessmen especially, and industrialists, ought to take a good look at themselves; they ought to stand aside and watch themselves go by. If they do, I am satisfied that they will discover amongst their blind spots certain basic misconceptions. The first of these is that most of us seem to think that the difference between a communist and a capitalist is about \$100; that, with money to buy a potato-chips stand and start in business for himself, nobody would want to be a communist. I need not point out to hon. members that this could not possibly explain why university professors like Dr. Boyer, wealthy men, turned communist, or Paul Robeson, and a good many more like these.

The second misconception is that so many of us think we can contain the communists on the other side of the Atlantic by economic, political and military measures and keep them down here in Canada by throwing insults at Russia, which measures, I might point out, are just about as futile as using a peashooter to try to stop a charging elephant, or by beating our breasts and crying about the Canadian way of life. I imagine that when the "commies" hear us perform in this manner they are likely to say, along with John Kendrick Bangs:

I love to watch the rooster crow,
He's like too many men I know,
Who brag and bluster, rant and shout
And beat their manly breasts, without
The first damn thing to crow about.

Just try, for example, to convince the average office worker with a family, who for some years has been caught between inflated prices and terribly high taxes on the one hand and a constant income on the other, that it is always fun to live in Canada. Just try to convince an old age pensioner who has had to live on \$30 a month with milk at 18 cents a quart, eggs at 54 cents a dozen and even tough brisket at 39 and 40 cents a pound, that the Canadian way of life is always good. Just try to convince an unskilled worker, who on a number of occasions has been laid off work at the first sign of business recession or depression and who has been forced into the headlines of unemployment, that we have a wonderful economic system. Try to convince a communist in this country—and there are many of them—that democracy, as it has been allowed to drift and become anaemic and washed out, is what he wants.

Let me assure hon. members of this house that the methods we have been using in this country cannot possibly immunize frustrated groups of people who by their very frustration become susceptible to the appeals of communism. I have reference to the ordinary mill-run of frustrated, fearful Canadians. If that is true in their case, how much more difficult would it be to successfully use the methods we have been using to teach the hardened communists, who are trained to create and exploit frustration in every democratic institution in our land and amongst all income groups of our people?

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the first reliable step we can possibly take in winning the cold war in which we become engaged by the signing of this pact is to clear up in our own country, and encourage cleaning up in all other countries, those attitudes and passions and conditions that breed communism. I heard one speaker put it very clearly a short time ago. He said, "It is no use just swatting