

*North Atlantic Treaty*

constitutional processes as requiring both parliamentary approval and governmental action.

Article 12 provides that the treaty may be reviewed at the end of ten years, and there may be very important changes to consider at that time in the light of the situation which may then exist.

Article 13 fixes the term of the treaty at a minimum of twenty-one years. The final article concerns arrangements for official texts of the treaty in French and in English.

The states which have been asked to send representatives to Washington for the signing of the treaty are twelve in number. Eight have been participating in the preliminary discussions: they are Belgium, Canada, France, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, the United Kingdom and the United States. These eight have invited four others to sign: Denmark, Iceland, Italy and Portugal. Of these four, I am sure that we are all happy to know that Denmark and Italy, democratic Italy, have already accepted this invitation. Together, these twelve states cover a wide area; they command great resources and great power. The strength of the group, however, lies not merely, as has already been pointed out, in its size or its resources, not only in its industry or its manpower. It will also be strong rather because its members have a common tradition of liberty, a common belief in the place of the individual in the state, a common heritage of political and social thought, a common resolve to remain free.

There are many states, not included in the alliance, which share our traditions, which believe in peace and freedom as we do, and which are strong and responsible members of this democratic community. Our relations with them will be no less cordial and our willingness to co-operate with them for mutual welfare and security will be no less effective because we have made this North Atlantic treaty.

There is nothing in this treaty that should produce an exclusive or isolationist or superior attitude among the members of this group. The world is too small, and its parts are too closely related, for even regional isolation. Because we shall have increased the measure of our own security, we shall not cease to be concerned about the welfare of like-minded and peace-loving states in other areas. Our commonwealth of nations, for instance, will be no less durable if two of its members sign this treaty. We shall continue to be aware that the various regions of the world are interdependent in security matters. We hope that elsewhere in the world peace may be strengthened by agreements similar to the

[Mr. Pearson.]

north Atlantic alliance or by associations such as the British commonwealth of nations.

The purpose of the North Atlantic pact is peace and security. It will fulfil this purpose in two ways.

First, it sets up administrative machinery for defence, for co-operation and consultation. This machinery can and will be effectively used by the members of this group, because they all accept the basic democratic principle that nations should conduct their business by mutual agreement, and not by force. Because these nations which sign this pact have mutual confidence and trust in each other, this pact should be effective.

Secondly, the treaty will be able to fulfil its purposes also because it will do what the United Nations has not yet succeeded in doing. It will call into being a preponderance of international force, subject to law, which will protect the members of the group and add to the freedom and the security of the world community.

The consequence of the pact may be, indeed must be, much more far-reaching than merely the provision of security. It can promote progress as well as preserve peace. If the outlines and foundations of this international community can be fashioned quickly and effectively enough to serve its emergency purpose, it should lead to the growth of freedom and order everywhere. It is in the confidence, therefore, that not only Canada, but with Canada, the whole of mankind will benefit from this treaty, that I have the honour to support this resolution approving of its draft terms.

**Mr. Jean François Pouliot (Temiscouata):** Neither Woodrow Wilson, Lloyd George and Clemenceau at Paris, nor Aristide Briand and Senator Dandurand at Locarno, nor Mackenzie King at Geneva spoke any better than the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Pearson) did tonight. He divided his speech into three parts. The first part was a lesson in geography; the second part was a discourse on universal history, which reminded me of the chef-d'œuvre of Jacques-Bénigne Bossuet; and the third part was a lesson on constitutional law.

I have not the gift of eloquence and I shall try to be practical with this instrument which is supposed to serve the benefit of mankind. I was on a parliamentary committee this afternoon, but I took cognizance of what was said here. Fine speeches were delivered: some speeches with punch and others with "oomph"; but the tenor of the debate was rather academic. I appreciate the fact that the leader of the opposition (Mr. Drew) apparently spoke as follows. I do not quote him verbatim: "We should review the cir-