

*North Atlantic Treaty*

Russia. It is inspiring to note that the treaty begins by the following words:

In the name of the One and Most Holy Trinity...

A brief examination of the Utrecht and Westphalia treaties shows that nations never did hesitate to seek guidance and protection from the Almighty.

Why then, on the occasion of the signing of the Atlantic treaty, is the sacred name of Him, from Whom all authority, rights and justice derive, not inscribed on the page where the history of humanity generally and of our country in particular is being written?

Why not follow the example of the Christian society of the past century who believed and rightly so that God only could seal human undertakings in so far as they were imbued with His spirit.

Our statesmen may exert themselves all they want, but as long as we do not put aside this pride, this deference to public opinion which is preventing us from declaring openly and without false shame our beliefs and faith, we shall find to our difficulties only temporary remedies, insufficient palliatives.

We are now faced with the problem of rediscovering a social order in which peace and happiness would once again be reasonably secure. Christianity is unquestionably the basis of every political system founded in order to provide the people with that measure of security and happiness to which they are entitled.

How can the peoples of the world have full and absolute confidence in a treaty that disregards the only true authority? There is still time, before signing the treaty, to insert a declaration of principle of the kind I suggest. Mr. Speaker, ninety per cent of the Canadian population now request this gesture on the part of the government.

There is another reason why the effects of the treaty cause a certain amount of anxiety.

Since its main immediate objective is to protect the signatory powers against any attempted aggression on the part of the only country in the world which, at present, not only could expand its rule but would apparently like to do so; since all countries concerned wish first and foremost to protect themselves against communist sway and communist philosophy, why should the only nation which, until now, has behaved consistently in this respect, be deliberately set aside?

[Mr. Dorion.]

We are committing a colossal blunder by failing to invite Spain to join with the nations who have signed the treaty. More than any other, this country is the only real rampart against communism.

Try to explain to our people, who know nothing of the narrow and petty interests that prevent the nations from accepting Spain's collaboration, try to explain, as I say, how it happens that the only country in the world that could rid itself of communism, after having endured the moral and physical sufferings with which we are acquainted, was not invited to co-operate, in order to ward off communism, with countries that contributed, unintentionally perhaps, but who nevertheless contributed to increase the power and strength of those against whom we now seek to protect ourselves.

May I be permitted to quote the testimony of a well-known Canadian, Mr. James S. Duncan, president of the Massey-Harris company. Returning from a trip to Europe, Mr. Duncan stated in Montreal on February 16 last:

It might be best to encourage rather than hinder the action of Catholic and Franco Spain.

There can be no doubt that in order to win the confidence of the peoples in a treaty such as this, we must first of all act logically.

Could it be due to the fact that she has a Catholic government that Spain is thus set aside and that her co-operation in the establishment of peace in the world is refused?

One has a right, Mr. Speaker, to ask such a question.

I now wish to quote an extract from a book published by Mr. Carleton J. H. Hayes. He was the American ambassador to Spain from 1942 to 1945, and I read from page 208 of his book, the following:

(Text):

Meanwhile, with the existing Spanish government, as with any Spanish government which, through evolution or internal revolution, may succeed it, the United States would do well, in my opinion, to pursue a policy of friendly relations. Spain and the Spanish people can be, regardless of their form of government, very serviceable to American interests at the present and in the future.

There remains, of course, a public opinion in the United States, besides other public opinions in Great Britain and Russia, hostile to the pursuit of such a policy. But the most hostile of this public opinion is, I am sure, peculiarly ill-informed, or a most selfishly interested and propagandist-directed, public opinion. There can be no doubt of the need and importance of public opinion in a democracy. But if a democracy is to act wisely, especially in the domain of foreign policy, and at the same time to reflect, as it should, the major public opinion of its people, it is of supreme importance that democratic public opinion be well-informed and truthful and honest. Public opinion which is fashioned and propagated