

*External Affairs*

signed the Declaration of Independence, with the exception of George Washington.

The British king refused to see these representatives and subsequently they went before the colonial office, but because it had not been presented to the king they refused to see the representatives of the 13 colonies or give any consideration to that petition. What these representatives, headed by John Hancock who was the first to sign, petitioned for is what has since been achieved within the commonwealth, under the crown: a unity, based on a common heritage, and a common dedication to democratic principles, and the acceptance of the principle that each of the member nations would be master in its own house. When considering the "ifs" of history, if that petition had been accepted the history of mankind might have been very different, for in the year 1775 there was embodied in that petition to the king the vital principles upon which the commonwealth is now based, and the principles upon which we are joined together in the common pursuit for freedom.

The Prime Minister in the statements he made, when speaking in India and in other parts of the commonwealth, asking that the United States be fairly judged, performed a function that only Canada could perform.

The Prime Minister made an explanation of some of his reported remarks during his tour. I hope he will explain what he had in mind when speaking in Bonn. He went further, I believe, than any prime minister has ever gone, and suggested that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization countries might join together in a political organization. I would ask the Prime Minister to advise the house and the country at some time during the debate what, if any, negotiations have taken place to this end, and what ideas he has as to the machinery of government which would permit political collaboration as between Canada and the other NATO countries. These are his words:

More particularly, many of us believe the peoples living about the great basin of the Atlantic ocean might well seek the solution to their problems of economic betterment, political stability and self-defence in this closer integration of their national resources and of their machinery and government.

Parliament has discussed integration of economic resources and the pooling relationship of member nations in NATO. But until the speech delivered by the Prime Minister nowhere have I heard it suggested that the NATO organization might lead to political integration. I feel that his remarks are somewhat ambiguous in their nature, and

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

deserve to be interpreted and explained so that we may understand exactly what are the implications in that statement.

I return to the matters dealt with by the Secretary of State for External Affairs. He dealt first with the Berlin conference and pointed out his apparent disappointment at its failure to agree to do anything but disagree and to convene a conference in Geneva. I feel that Molotov, by the propaganda speeches he made, succeeded in part in achieving what the minister stated above everything else should be prevented, namely, the driving of any wedge of disunity between the members of the NATO nations.

Each of the free nations must realize that the price of survival for each of us is the unity of all of us. Today, according to the press, the effectiveness of the U.S.S.R. propaganda would appear to be achieved to a degree for France, reliant, powerful and vital at the Berlin conference, as represented by Mr. Bidault, being fearful of a rearmed Germany, is in a position where the European defence community treaty, which has been ratified in recent weeks by several countries, stands in grave danger.

The New York *Times* service today says that France's foreign policy in Europe and Asia appears to be stalled because the French government feels unable to bring the European army treaty to a vote with any chance of success and that the supporters of General de Gaulle, most of whom oppose the European army, have acquired a virtual veto power over any action that might be taken by the present government. France fears, and rightly, from the experience of eighty years and three wars, the rearmament of Germany. United States and Britain favour Germany entering the plan and in order to arrive at a compromise suggested that the rearmament clause should not come into effect until each one of the signatory nations had signed and agreed to the treaty.

Suggestions are being made—and I think the Secretary of State for External Affairs used words that indicate that alternatives are being considered—that there are alternatives to the EDC which are available and ready to meet the contingencies which will arise in the event that EDC is not ratified. The secretary of state said in effect that we hope ere long the EDC or "something like it" will come into existence. It might be well for the minister, when replying, to place before the house and the country something of the nature of the alternatives which will be available to the nations joined together under the European defence community if and provided that ratification by France and