

*North Atlantic Treaty*

already assumed. The first article of the first chapter of the United Nations charter reads as follows:

The purposes of the United Nations are:

1. To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace;
2. To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principles of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace;
3. To achieve international co-operation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion; and
4. To be a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of those common ends.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that while the words of the present pact may be different, those words which I have just read embrace, in their explicit and in their implicit meaning, all we are now asked to undertake in the draft convention which is before us. It would be appropriate, however, for us at this time to ask ourselves whether the promise held out in that first article of the United Nations charter has in fact been fulfilled. We all know it has not. The very basis of that charter was the proposition that all nations were entitled to their freedom and self-determination. If anyone be in doubt as to whether that promise has been fulfilled, ask the people of Poland, whose freedom became the symbol of freedom everywhere when we went to war in 1939, whether the United Nations charter has been effective in preserving their freedom. Ask the peoples of Roumania, of Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Hungary, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, northern Greece, Czechoslovakia and eastern Germany. Yes, let us also ask hundreds of millions of the people of China, who for so long stood against Japanese aggression, if the United Nations charter has protected them from aggression. The United Nations charter can still become the great instrument of freedom that it was intended to be, but the veto exercised by the representatives of the soviet empire has so far defeated its primary purpose and made this new pact necessary if those who are still free are to remain free.

There are no more tragic pages in the history of civilized people than the repeated stories of the hopeless failure of pact after pact to preserve that measure of peace and security which was the dream—and the earnest dream—of those who participated in each succeeding and more terrible war.

There is no occasion to direct our remarks today to the question of whether or not Canada will sign this pact, when it is in final form. About that I do not believe there can be any real difference of opinion. I submit that what is really important in our discussions here today is that we indicate very clearly that we Canadians want this pact to work and that it is not just being signed as a matter of form. For that reason I think we should review the circumstances which brought about the failure of the other pacts which have preceded it. As we now express our hope for the success of the draft agreement that is before us, let us examine the reason for the failures of the past. While efforts have been made since the dawn of civilization to find some device for preventing the recurring and awful scourge of war, we can well confine ourselves to the past fifty years during which the most notable attempts to establish collective security have been made and during which events have occurred which are well within the memory of many hon. members in this chamber today.

The first time that an attempt was made to establish a world-wide organization under which there would be collective action to preserve peace was fifty years ago when the representatives of twenty-six nations met at The Hague. As a result of their deliberations, the participating nations signed what was known as "The Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes."

The second world peace conference met again at The Hague in 1907. To show the growing interest in the possibilities of collective action as a means of assuring peace, it should be recalled that on that occasion forty-four nations, practically all the independent nations in the world at that time, met to reaffirm the convention which had been signed in 1899 and to extend its provisions. The conference unanimously adopted a provision calling for compulsory arbitration of all international disputes and the setting up of a "court of arbitration."

Great hopes for lasting peace were entertained at that time. There is no dead page of history. People at that time believed, and firmly believed, that this offered the hope of lasting peace. But the nations which had signed the convention unfortunately acted as though they thought their work was done when the conventions were signed. When the Agadir crisis came in 1911 and brought Europe to the verge of war, the member nations of the Triple Entente faced the threat from the Triple Alliance with no real indication that they believed The Hague convention provided any practical means for avoid-