

*North Atlantic Treaty*

in my view, a providential power in national politics raised up Winston Churchill who led that fine nation eventually to victory. Great Britain herself cannot afford the terrific blood bath that she had to go through from 1939 to 1945.

Take the Netherlands. That fine little nation had no quarrel with the world during the last conflict. By blood ties she was closely affiliated with Germany to some extent. She was supposed to be outside of the war highways in Europe, but what happened to that fine little nation? All you have to do at the present time is to look at the horrible holocaust and the near destruction of Amsterdam which was visited on her by the hordes of barbarism coming from Berlin who tried to destroy that nation. Prior to 1939 the Netherlands, like some other neutral nations, did not realize the dangers which existed at the time not only to her but to other neutral nations who tried to live by themselves without the support of other nations. They were playing into the hands of the aggressors, as are other neutral nations who speak only of neutrality without trying to take part in the pact which we are discussing at the present time, which is a pact for their own salvation, and to all democratic nations.

What happened to Belgium? For many years France, although thinking that she was strong in her Maginot line, made appeal after appeal to the fine Belgian people, whose king and his army remained within the borders of Belgium during war number one. He did not leave his own soil. He remained on a little piece of his own soil away from his capital for over four years. Certainly Belgium does not desire war at the present time. Through a terrific and costly lesson Belgium has learned, as have other smaller or bigger neutral countries, that she cannot remain by herself.

Did Norway ever expect that because of her situation in Europe the nazis would ever have the audacity or the thought of invading her? What happened without any provocation of any kind from Norway? Without any hint whatever that they were going to be foully attacked, the first thing they knew was that they were under the bondage of Hitler and his hordes. Although Norway is in a very difficult and delicate situation at the present time she is going to be one of the signatories of the Atlantic pact.

Luxembourg is a very small nation; that is, small in numbers it is true; but these nations carry with them the same national pride as the bigger nations have. The same thing happened to Luxembourg in 1914.

[Mr. Bradette.]

Luxembourg suffered on her own soil. She endured great losses of human life, and of material destruction.

I now come to Italy. I am glad of the fact that the Italian government and the Italian upper house have passed the Atlantic treaty and that Italy is sending her representative to Washington, because she is realizing the dangers and the deadly threats that a dictatorship has to a fine nation like herself. I know that she will be welcomed by the nations who are going to sign at Washington in a few days. Perhaps this is not the time to say this, but I hope that in the not far distant future the Italian nation will be part of the United Nations organization.

May I say one word about Denmark? Denmark will also be a signatory. She has suffered. She had no quarrel with the German people; she had no quarrel with the rest of the world. Those fine, industrious people, who are making a comfortable living in a section of Europe in which any other nation would, I believe, experience near famine, were crushed and almost pulverized under the heel of Hitler. She has realized also, as have some of the other smaller nations, that her salvation resides in a pact of this kind, because all real democracies will combine their resources for the protection of those who need it.

I have no time to read article 2, but I believe it carries within itself a message which will be considered by the signatories, and which will also be discussed. On second thought I think I shall read it. It reads as follows:

The parties will contribute toward the further development of peaceful and friendly international relations by strengthening their free institutions, by bringing about a better understanding of the principles upon which these institutions are founded, and by promoting conditions of stability and well-being. They will seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies and will encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them.

I lay special emphasis on the two words "economic policies". Are we going to fall into the same pitfall as we did after 1918? It seems to me that as far as the economic condition is concerned, we are following the same dangerous line as we did three years after world war I, when we saw the jigsaw puzzle erected by all the nations of the world: higher and higher tariffs, embargoes and trade restrictions. When we saw that, we all knew that there was danger, because an economic war generally brings on a martial war. There is always danger when you stop, if not entirely, the free flow of goods into every section of the world. There is danger that somebody will suffer or some nation will be hurt internally, and in most instances this leads to armed conflict. Mr.