

External Affairs

arming of men already in Europe, men who are there, who have to be fed, clothed and lodged even if they are not armed, is going to provide much larger forces than the expenditure of the same amount of money in raising, equipping, arming, training, feeding, clothing and sheltering young Canadians who would, under the present condition of full employment, have to be drawn from the productive stream of this nation.

And the Prime Minister at another point on that same page said to an hon. member who had asked him a question:

I will say to him at once that the government of Canada at this time is not considering the raising of Canadian forces to dispatch to Europe as a deterrent to aggression in Europe.

So that we can say that just four short years ago no country was following more clearly and laying down more clearly a policy of continental security; that the job of European defence is a job for the Europeans. Surely, we shall help them with money and so on, but we are not going to help them with armed forces because their defence is primarily their own problem. And four short years later, not even four full years later, our Secretary of State for External Affairs condemns what he says is the implication in Secretary Dulles' speech of the return to continental defence policy.

It is interesting to see how far we have come in those four years along lines which I think we now all agree are correct; and the development which is important there is that we now have forces in Europe. We have a brigade group, we have an air division. The question now before us and the question with which most hon. members will agree with me is one that we are entitled to demand that this government should answer is: What happens under these conditions to the concept which has always been the accepted principle in Canada that there shall be consultation, not only between governments but between government and parliament before Canadians are permitted to act?

One recalls the history of discussions of this type. One realizes immediately that it has always been the accepted principle that the government will consult parliament, not only before there shall be declaration of war particularly but even before committing Canadian troops to military action. We can remind ourselves of what the Secretary of State for External Affairs said in March 1949, when he was discussing the North Atlantic treaty which had then just come into effect. At page 2098 of *Hansard* of March 28, 1949 the Secretary of State for External Affairs is reported to have said:

I need hardly add that if, in spite of our efforts to keep the peace, some member of this alliance is attacked and we are called upon to fulfil our
[Mr. Fulton.]

commitments, this country, this parliament and this government will act with the necessary determination and dispatch. So far as this government is concerned, Mr. Speaker, in the face of a national emergency so grave as to call into force our commitments under this pact, it would immediately desire to consult parliament. This has now become a regular procedure in our history, and no one of course would wish to depart from it. No government could fulfil the responsibility which action under this treaty would impose without being certain of the support of the people of this country expressed through their representatives in parliament.

There we have the principle enunciated by the Secretary of State for External Affairs in the first discussion of the North Atlantic treaty that before committing our forces to action we would consult parliament. If that were not definite enough the minister repeated himself on September 6, 1950, at the special session, where his remarks are reported at page 351 of *Hansard*. May I just remind the house that article 5 of the North Atlantic treaty states:

The parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all; and consequently they agree that, if such an armed attack occurs, each of them, in exercise of the right of individual or collective self-defence recognized by article 51 of the charter of the United Nations, will assist the party or parties so attacked by taking forthwith, individually and in concert with the other parties, such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force, to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area.

It was in the light of that commitment and speaking on this subject at a later date that the minister said as reported at page 351 of *Hansard* for September 6, 1950:

If there is an attack made on a member of the North Atlantic group, that is an attack on all the members of the group.

He was then asked by the hon. member for Vancouver-Quadra (Mr. Green):

Including Canada?

And the minister answered:

Including Canada.

After some further words which do not change the substance of the quotation the minister said:

Parliament would then decide whether an attack had or had not been made on Canada. If parliament decided that such an attack had been made and we were at war, it is the custom of Canadians when they are attacked to fight back with materials and with men.

Then a little later he said:

I thought I had made that clear. An attack on western Germany which involved Canada by the decision of its parliament and its obligations under the North Atlantic pact would be met by materials and men.

What then is the position in the light of the fact that we have a brigade in Europe? Supposing the Russians attack in Germany