

directly connected with war expenditures, to cover increased activities of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. The sum total, honourable senators, of what we have spent, the commitments we have made, and what we are asking for in the future, is the staggering sum of almost \$1,500 million.

The *New York Times* of last Monday, in an interesting article on the armament program of the United States, showed clearly the tremendous cost of producing and maintaining modern weapons of war. According to the article, the total appropriation bill presented to Congress amounted to 36.2 billion dollars, to which should be added an amount passed by the house, and now awaiting Senate action, of 16.8 billion dollars. These amounts, plus an additional \$10 billion for which the President will likely ask, make a total of \$63 billion, of which more than \$45 billion is to be used directly for military expenses. This expenditure reduced to a per capita basis means that every man, woman and child will have to pay \$300 each towards the cost of armaments. Though these sums appear fantastic, they are probably far less, as my honourable friend has pointed out, than may have to be contemplated by the United States and Canada should the international situation grow worse.

The honourable leader opposite raised a question which is asked by many serious-minded people today: Why was it that when the Korean war broke out the United States, which had an armament expenditure of \$14 billion a year for some years, plus an additional amount for atomic research, had only about eleven divisions under arms and these were not up to full strength? With all Canada's activities on land, on the sea and in the air, we were prepared at that time to put into combat only a brigade of three or four thousand men. The reason for that situation, of course, is increased expenditures for armament purposes. Large as our appropriations have been, we were able to provide only a skeleton organization which could, when necessary, train a larger combat force. This basic organization provided facilities for the rapid expansion of needed armed strength for defence purposes.

A realization of the staggering expenditures of the United States, and to a lesser extent of Canada, for an inadequate defence force, causes one to speculate on the program that must have been in operation in Russia during the past few years. The honourable leader of the opposition in the other house quoted some figures on Russia's military strength today as given by a member of the British government. It was said that she had about three million men under arms, or 175 divisions, which could be expanded within a few

months to a force of five and a half million to six million strong. Further, it was said, that Russia has 40,000 tanks,—seven times as many as the United States—19,000 aircraft, many of which are of the latest jet propulsion type, and 360 submarines, 200 of which are of the largest and most modern construction.

Hon. Mr. Haig: May I ask the honourable leader whether it is true that one of those submarines recently visited Halifax?

Hon. Mr. Robertson: I would not attempt to express an opinion on that question, for my honourable friend has as much knowledge of that matter as I have. I might well ask him if it is true that Canada has recently been visited by a Russia submarine. While I have no special information on the subject, I presume that the rumour was true.

Hon. Mr. Duff: Nonsense! A Russian submarine was never there.

Hon. Mr. Quinn: They have been seen in the Bay of Fundy.

Hon. Mr. Robertson: My honourable friends know more about the subject than I do.

I make a comparison between the present military strength of Russia and the United States to show what a country of 200 million people can do. I take the figures in this respect to show that since the last war Russia has maintained an army of three million men and an air strength of 19,000 aircraft. Think of the tremendous cost of keeping this equipment, which rapidly becomes obsolescent, up to date. Bearing in mind the relatively low production of Russia, it becomes obvious that she has been taxing her productive facilities heavily to produce arms and equipment on the scale to which I have referred. We are just now having a taste of what a much smaller armament program costs. Though the financial structure of Russia differs from our own, nevertheless the arming and equipping of 300 million men is an enormous feat.

Hon. Mr. Horner: How many millions of slave labourers does Russia have to do the work?

Hon. Mr. Robertson: Generally speaking, the men of an army are young and active, and there is nothing to indicate that slave labour is more intelligent than any other type of labour. After all, the population of Russia is only fifty million more than that of the United States, a highly productive nation.

I have always felt that even if Russia's armed strength were a fraction of that claimed for her, that in gaining that strength she must have taxed her productive capacity to such an extent as to reduce her standard of living to a very low level.