

*North Atlantic Treaty*

Whereas representatives of the government of Canada have been participating since last July in negotiations looking towards the preparation of a treaty for collective self-defence within the framework of the charter, and

Whereas it is proposed that a conference be held early in April in Washington for the purpose of completing such a treaty among the following states of the North Atlantic area—Belgium, Canada, France, Luxembourg, The Netherlands, Norway, the United Kingdom and the United States and such other states as might by agreement become parties,

Therefore be it resolved—

1. That this house declares anew its support of the United Nations as the world organization established to maintain international peace and security and to promote the economic and social advancement of all peoples, and reaffirms its faith in the principles and purposes of the charter of the United Nations.

2. That this house recognizes that the conclusion, among states of the North Atlantic area, of a treaty within the meaning of article 51 of the charter is, in present circumstances, of vital importance for the protection of Canada, the preservation of peace, and the development of political, social and economic co-operation among the North Atlantic democracies.

3. That this house agrees that Canada should be represented at this conference, and that the representatives of Canada at the conference should use their best endeavour to assist in the completion of an acceptable treaty based on the proposed text as tabled on March 18.

4. That any such treaty, should before ratification, be submitted to the houses of parliament for approval.

**Mr. Pouliot:** Thank you, sir. I shall try to be as brief as possible. We have heard so much being said about the threat of communism and the infiltration of communism in some public organizations in this country. But I thought it was my duty to warn my leader against the progress of communism at that time.

I knew several members of the cabinet were ready to disallow the padlock law. I thought that it was the right thing, and I appealed to the political acumen of the leader of the Liberal party at that time, saying to him, "Sir, you have to make your choice between Cardinal Villeneuve and Tim Buck". He did so, and the padlock law was never repealed. And it is precisely because I think now as I did then that I did my duty as a Canadian citizen and as a Liberal in advising my leader not to commit the blunder and mistake of disallowing the padlock law, when I did not see what business the Secretary of State for External Affairs had in denouncing the padlock law in the name of human rights and fundamental freedom.

He does not know what happened then. At least, I give him the benefit of the doubt, and my contention is that he did not know the trouble we had at that time when the leader of the Liberal party, the then Prime Minister, had to weigh the pros and cons and make a decision which would not divide Canada.

How is it that when a man is so busy remembering the names of all the capitals of

[Mr. St. Laurent.]

other countries—Afghanistan, and all the other places in the world—he should have the time to denounce the padlock law which was passed in 1936, which is still on the statute books, and which in my humble way I contributed to help keep on the statute books?

Well, there is more to it—much more to it. The hon. member spoke about manpower. He referred to article 3 and then to article 5, referring to it as the heart of the North Atlantic pact. He said what we needed was a pledge for economic affairs. The United Kingdom has a pledge for economic affairs in dealing with Russia, and the New York papers are full of it—full of the trade dealings of the socialist government of Great Britain with Russia. I wonder if Mr. Bevin finds there a pledge for economic affairs. He would need a padlock law on some of his papers.

Then the minister said that this was a more effective step to remove the economic and political causes of war, and added afterward that it was not a change in our policy toward the United Nations. Every speech made on the North Atlantic pact was a funeral oration of the United Nations pact—a fine oration, if you wish, but a first-class burial. I do not see how it can be said that it is not a change in our policy toward the United Nations. He said that no conference to bring about peace was too tedious. I do not think that conferences are tedious, because they are well attended by many people. People go everywhere to attend conferences. It reminds me of what one of my confreres, a counsel of the bar in Montreal, told me one day. I asked about something that had been said by one of my confreres, and I said that I did not see the use of it. He said, "You must understand that some people have to meet together, and as long as they meet, even if they decide nothing, everything is all right". That was what happened in all these conferences that people attended in all the countries of the world. No progress has been made. That is why we have another gadget now, and this is it.

I cannot speak solemnly about it, although I think very seriously about war, and I am very much concerned about war. It would be most unfair for anyone to say that I do not realize that at the present time the world situation is most critical. Probably it is. I do not know; I am not in a position to tell any secrets about it; but according to what we hear from all over, and from what we read in the newspapers of the United States, of England and of Canada, the world is in a condition of unstable equilibrium. It is unfortunate, but that is the situation.

The minister spoke about manpower. Who will decide about manpower? Did we decide