

*North Atlantic Treaty*

pact and under present conditions, the burden of armaments and the threat to recovery would be greater if the western European nations alone, and one by one, attempted to arm against the overwhelming manpower of the cominform nations.

Then, too, because of our own geographical situation, our military preparedness would be a crippling burden to us. As a part of the North Atlantic fraternity both our danger and our burdens should be lessened. But whatever burdens in the field of defence are involved—and let me say this to the government with all the emphasis that I can give it—no one must be allowed to profit in the production of instruments of war. We urged before the last war that all munitions industries should be nationalized. We reiterate that now and demand that profiteering in related industries must be eliminated by every means at our disposal.

However, history alone will record whether the North Atlantic security pact will succeed or not. Failure will mean the end of civilization as we know it.

We must, therefore, in our strength seek understanding, friendship and co-operation with all nations so that the men and women who sacrificed, suffered and died in the two great wars which have plagued our generation will not have been sacrificed in vain.

It is in that spirit, Mr. Speaker, that we support Canada's participation in the conference to be held at Washington, and we hope that the representative of Canada will endeavour to bring back to this house a document and treaty to which this house can accord unanimous ratification.

**Mr. Solon E. Low (Peace River):** At the outset I should like to congratulate the Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent) on submitting this resolution to the house. It is the first time in my experience here that the government has placed an international treaty before parliament in an effort to obtain the opinions and support of the representatives of the people before the signing of the treaty, and thereby in a sense committing Canada to the terms of the agreement. We of the Social Credit group think that this method of submitting the resolution is the right way to get approval before the people of this country are committed to international obligations.

One of the strenuous objections we took at the time of the United Nations charter was to the government's insistence on committing us to the terms of the San Francisco charter without giving the electors of this country anything like a reasonable opportunity to know what it was to which they were being committed, and more important still, sir, to register their wishes in regard to the charter

[Mr. Coldwell.]

before it was signed. In this instance the Prime Minister is playing the game of democracy. There is only one thing that sometimes makes us wonder. Why the rush?

The treaty itself was not tabled in this house until March 18, at a time when every single member was overwhelmed with other things demanding his immediate attention. I do not need to mention the three sessions a day which took up all of our time. Therefore I do not see how, under the circumstances, anybody could give the pact the study which it deserves.

Now we are told that our representatives must be in Washington on April 4 to commit Canada to the treaty. I am afraid this follows the old familiar pattern of doing things. One suspects something wrong under such circumstances. All over the country there has been elaborate propaganda in all of the newspapers long before the facts about the pact were divulged to people in this country. I remember the same kind of propaganda filled every nook and cranny of every newspaper in this country prior to the Rowell-Sirois report, Bretton Woods and all that sort of thing. It is high time that the government began to get wise to that sort of thing, because it is bound to continue to arouse suspicion, and there may be something really good which they want to put over sometime, and yet they will find the people suspicious of that because of the general pattern they are following. There is no doubt that all of the propaganda which appeared in the newspapers and periodicals preceding the instruments which I have specifically mentioned was designed to set the stage for rushing the matters through on a wave of emotional hysteria. If all of these agreements are important enough to be signed, they are important enough to warrant the most careful and searching study.

May I say a word about the resolution itself. The preamble seems straightforward enough. Here again there seems to be considerable departure from some of the practices of the past. All too often, the preambles to resolutions introducing international instruments which are introduced in this house are put in very high-sounding and beautiful phrases, the spirit of which is certainly unquestionable, but which all too often is completely at variance with the body of the resolution itself. I find myself quite in agreement with the terms of the preamble, but I cannot see why it was necessary to insert the first clause in the body of the resolution itself. This is what the clause says:

This house declares anew its support of the United Nations as the world organization established to