

And I don't think anyone in Canada dreams of the possibility of arming this country so we could take on a great power single-handed. What we have to do - what all the free countries have to do - is to try to strike the best possible balance between the provision of immediate strength in trained men and arms-in-being; and lasting potential strength, military, industrial and economic. This is a most difficult balance to strike.

I imagine all of you have heard of Dr. Vannevar Bush, the great American scientist who was the organizer of scientific research during the last war and who directed the activities which resulted in the production of the atomic bomb. Dr. Bush recently published a book called "Modern Arms and Free Men" which discusses this problem of achieving our objectives in the cold war in a way which appealed to me very much.

On the specific question of how much of a nation's resources should be spent on defence, Dr. Bush warns us that the cold war is likely to last for a long time and that, so long as there is sufficient strength to withstand an immediate shock, what will be decisive is the capacity to endure and the demonstration of the superiority of our political and social institutions. I was particularly struck by one passage which I should like to repeat to you today. These are Dr. Bush's words:

"There is, however, more than one way of losing the race. We have not gone far in it yet, and we already feel the pinch. The race can be lost, as all long races that depend upon man's endurance can be lost, either by doing too little or by trying to do too much too soon. It will profit us little to have stocks of bombs and planes and then to bring our governmental and industrial systems crashing down about our ears. This is a long, hard race we are embarked upon; we had better settle into harness for the long pull and mark well how we use our resources."

And let me remind you again that our first purpose is to prevent the cold war from becoming a shooting war. On that point, too, I am going to risk another quotation from Dr. Bush. About half way through the book he has this to say about the prospect of preventing a shooting war:

"It need not come if we fully maintain our strength. It need not come if we realistically enough and with enough determination resolve that it shall not. It need not come if we really learn to make our democracy work. It need not come at all, for if the strength of free peoples prevents it for a generation, that same strength can then produce a new sort of world in which great wars will no longer occur. For this consummation we face a task that will test us as we have never been tested before, that will test whether we really mean it when we say that we believe in human dignity and human freedom, whether we can really submerge selfishness and petty motive, and bring our enormous latent power to bear, to make our way of life function with true effectiveness for the good of all."

That is a view to which I think we can all subscribe, and that is precisely why I feel the cold war is also a total war requiring the mobilization -- in a constructive manner -- of all our resources, including our moral resources.

To win the cold war it will not be enough to devote to military defences and the production and development of arms a considerable fraction of our total resources. That may be enough