

*North Atlantic Treaty*

had vindicated the faith that lay behind their political institutions and proved the strength of their democratic way of life. They now demanded, in terms that could not be mistaken by any government, that in the future trial by such hard ordeal should not again be necessary. As they surveyed a background of the years of war through which they had come, they saw many occasions when the free nations, if they had acted in harmony and in strength, might have dissipated the danger of German aggression without war. Too late they discovered that the tools which might have meant their salvation had been ready to their hands, if they had only had the courage to use them.

The last war, then, taught us at least this one lesson, that the nations must act together to keep the peace, and, as the instrument for such collective action, some effective international organization must be set up.

The first consequence of this lesson was the founding of the United Nations. The charter, signed at San Francisco in 1945, is a long and complicated document, but its purpose is simple. Member states agree to act together; to resist aggression wherever it may occur; to co-operate for the purpose of removing the causes of war. In the United Nations they established an international agency which they thought at that time would be satisfactory for these purposes. But as has already been pointed out by more than one speaker today, the mood of 1945 was too optimistic. It was natural, then, that the nations which by their united effort had won the greatest war in history against the most ruthless and determined enemy that man had up to that time known should believe that they could accomplish what must have seemed at that time to be the easier task of maintaining peace.

Unhappily, however, the basic requirements for the full success of the United Nations did not carry over from war to peace. The unity of the great powers, upon which almost everything depended, was soon eaten away by the acids of post-war controversy. At the war's end a dozen or more great and contentious political issues rose from the political confusion of western Europe and eastern Asia. Basically these problems could all be reduced to one great question: How far would the soviet union go in exploiting the post-war situation so as to extend its territory and increase its might? That question was no idle speculation. We had seen the boundaries of Russia extended, first in 1939 and 1940 at the expense of Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia and Finland. And as the war went on it became clear that the promise of freedom to Poland would not include those eastern Polish provinces which were in fact eventually sur-

rendered by Poland to the U.S.S.R. After the war, parts of Roumania, Czechoslovakia and Hungary were added to the U.S.S.R. so that by 1945 the boundaries of the soviet union had been pushed farther to the west than ever before in Russian history.

Not content with this expansion, the U.S.S.R. then proceeded to surround itself with a group of satellite governments; imposing its will upon neighbouring peoples through local communist parties supported by Russian forces. The list alone of these captive regimes is evidence of the coercion which created them. As the leader of the opposition (Mr. Drew) pointed out this afternoon, who could believe that the Poles, a people who for centuries with courage and resolve had fought against all comers for their freedom, would submit of their own free will to soviet control? For one hundred years the insistent demand for freedom of the Roumanians, Hungarians, Bulgars, Czechs and the Slovaks had been one of the strongest forces in European history. Only when it has been suppressed by ruthless physical superiority has this force lain dormant. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, we already see in Yugoslavia a sign that the peoples of eastern Europe are beginning to realize that the yoke that has been laid upon them is heavy, degrading and unbearable. The one border territory which has managed effectively to maintain its independence is Finland, but even there the long and menacing hand of Moscow threatens dire punishment if the slightest soviet interest seems to be prejudiced.

The tight control which the U.S.S.R. has established by these oppressive means in eastern Europe has been given a false facade of international respectability by treaty arrangements. The soviet government, and communists throughout the world, have been charging that the proposed Atlantic treaty is an offensive threat aimed at them. But they had no hesitation in initiating and negotiating, by other methods it is true, collective treaty arrangements in eastern Europe long before the Atlantic treaty was even considered. We are not sure how many of these treaties and agreements there are amongst the communist states, because, in spite of the terms of the United Nations charter, only a very few of them have been registered with the United Nations. So far as we can tell, however, there are over fifty treaties and agreements amongst the group of communist states comprising the U.S.S.R., Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Roumania and Bulgaria. These are variously termed treaties for friendship and mutual assistance, co-operation and mutual assistance, collaboration and mutual aid, economic collaboration and reciprocal delivery of goods, trade and payment.

[Mr. Pearson.]