

existing difficulties which impede the transfer of equipment and supplies among the north Atlantic nations so as to permit the maximum use of their productive capacities. Solution of these difficulties is necessary if full advantage is to be taken, for instance, of Canada's present and potential productive capacity by the north Atlantic countries. The responsibilities of membership under the North Atlantic Treaty cannot of course be discharged merely by setting up committees or staffs of experts for research and planning, however useful this may be. Such responsibilities can only be fulfilled by the governments and the peoples concerned.

Under the mutual aid and self-help article of the treaty we in Canada are committed to participation in this collective enterprise in the manner in which such participation will be most effective. But until investigation of the needs of our partners is more complete, and until military planning in detail is further advanced, it would be premature, I suggest, to predict the appropriate form and scale of our participation. It will of course have to be related to the capacities and requirements of our economy and the economies of all the other signatories.

I should like to conclude the brief mention I have made of this particular subject by quoting a paragraph from a very significant book entitled "Modern Arms and Free Men", by Dr. Vannevar Bush, in which he said:

The race--

He is referring to the race for security, indeed the race for survival.

--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.

He went on to say:

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.

The world situation has been changed, not only by the developments which I have attempted to sketch briefly, but also by the realization that the perils of the atomic age will increase through the manufacture of atomic weapons of ever-increasing destructiveness, culminating, if it is culmination, in the so-called H bomb. On this question--and reference has already been made to it in the house during the present session--I suggest that our policy as to atomic weapons should be twofold. On the one hand, we of the free world must continue to strive by every means possible--and I hope to elaborate on this somewhat in a moment--for that kind of international agreement for the effective control of atomic energy that will give us some real chance of security against the horrible possibility of atomic warfare. On the other hand, so long as the danger of such warfare remains, we together with friendly states with whom we can co-operate, must do our best to see that we do not lag behind in the development of knowledge and skill in the field of atomic energy. It is important also to convince, if that is possible, those with whom we find it difficult to co-operate that atomic weapons will never be used by us for any aggressive purpose.