

*North Atlantic Treaty*

know it did not work. We had NATO, and NATO is to be streamlined into a new organization. Where it will all finish, I do not know. Sometimes I complained about the way things were handled at these gatherings and everyone thought that I was not orthodox, that I was speaking about things of which I had no knowledge. Events proved that I was right, because nothing was good enough. There is a perpetual change in that kind of business. Then there was the interim report from the committee of five on non-military co-operation, and that will be discussed at Lisbon. The minister did not tell the house what the vote of Canada was in the contest between Greece and Byelorussia for election to the United Nations security council. The minister should have no secrets from the house. If he does not want to make the matter public, he could easily have the galleries cleared. It is not a complicated affair because there is a rule of the house to that effect.

Then the minister said that big questions were not decided in Rome. It was an interim meeting. The member for Peel (Mr. Graydon) said that they cannot all be interim meetings. I say that perhaps it is a good thing to have only interim meetings so that matters may come to shape in the right way. We should know what is going on, and again if it is of importance that the information should not be given to the public at large, the minister could inform the house in camera. There was another thing in the minister's statement that struck me, and I have just a few facts to mention. The overlapping membership and possible military planning in building up a separate Middle East or Mediterranean pact would invoke problems of inclusion and exclusion which would not be settled easily. These matters are always settled easily when good will is shown. At the present time we have signed a protocol for the admission of Turkey and Greece to NATO. Turkey is a great country and the people are wonderful diplomats. So far they have been doing very well, and they are honest people. The Greeks are courageous and would be an asset to us.

In my humble opinion, if we are to have an Atlantic pact, the more members we have the better. If we are to include Turkey and Greece amongst the Atlantic pact nations, why not stop and take Spain on the way? What is the objection to Spain? It would be easy to have them with us, and they would be an asset. Some people are afraid to talk about Spain. Spain would be a loyal ally. There is no reason for not having Spain. We go as far away as Greece and Turkey, and the

more nations we have the better. I am in favour of it. It extends the area of our responsibility, but the thing deserves consideration. Moreover, Greece and Turkey were invited to become full members of the North Atlantic council, and I am sure that if the invitations were extended to Spain she would accept at once. Not so long ago President Truman changed his mind about Spain and gave her a large amount of money to have improved conditions in that country. If Tito is good enough for us, Franco would not be any worse.

Then, the protocol does not extend the nature of our obligations under the North Atlantic treaty, but it does extend the area of our obligations. It cannot extend the nature, because the nature is specified in the treaty, as the hon. gentleman knows very well. The area is extended, but it means that two other countries will be joined with us in that pact. The minister added it is more theoretical than real, but an aggression on those countries would mean world war III. This is well understood. On the other hand, the more powerful the organization is the less danger of war. It is for that reason I am pleased to see Turkey and Greece become members of NATO. I hope that Portugal will follow, then Spain, Italy and the other countries. How is it we have NATO meeting in Rome? Rome is willing to come into the North Atlantic council and there would be no Russian veto, but the veto would come from England and France, especially against Spain. This is a time when we should be careful.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to refer again to what Mr. Eden said during his tour of the United States. It was published in an Associated Press dispatch dated Chicago, August 20. It stated that Mr. Eden found the Atlantic pact was inadequate to protect the western world against the communist menace. Then, he suggested a larger and more general organization which would take into account the demands of each front, would make a survey of the resources, and would seek to allocate them according to the needs. It would be a supergovernment. He said that he did not think NATO was adequate from that point of view. And then he added: "During the war", declared Eden, "several of us were hoping that the United Nations would serve as a practical example as well as a precept toward unity." That is Wendell Willkie's key, one world, one government, one supergovernment. What the minister did not mention in his statement was put in a dispatch of the Associated Press of December 27. I have not the English text, but I will translate it as well as I can. It is a matter of supreme importance to all