

*North Atlantic Treaty*

chance of gaining security through NATO, we must adopt adequate economic measures to support the NATO nations of Europe, including Britain.

To support the validity of what I have just said, may I use Britain as an illustration. The other day I advocated that we should advance a credit to Britain. There were those who thought that my reason was that I was imperialistic and pro-British and all that sort of nonsense. Those people are simply deluding themselves. In the case of Britain there is a real need which we must face or we shall suffer, just as surely as we are sitting here in the House of Commons.

The facts of our time once more force Britain to call: "Send us the tools and we will finish the job." The job is there to finish. It is there, big, ugly, risky, lengthy—more so than it was before. For America, for Canada and for each Canadian—and I mean each—the question is easy to see and easy to understand. Shall we send Britain's boys the tools to finish the job, or shall we refuse Britain's boys the tools, through refusing economic aid to Britain, and then finally buy the tools anyway and send Canadian boys to deliver them?

Britain does not flinch; she does not quail; she does not shirk. Her head is bare, still bloody, but unbowed. Britain will do all she can; but she cannot fight her best without food, without clothes and without shelter to keep her people fit; not only her forces, but her people. She cannot fight MIG jets with hand staves, or Stalin tanks with ox-carts.

The war that now threatens—and this is a good thing for certain Canadians in Canada to keep in mind—is not of Britain's making. It is not of the making of the British commonwealth, either in whole or in part, directly or indirectly. Neither was world war II a war of Britain's making, nor was world war I a war of Britain's making in any sense or degree. In each and every one of these calamities we have been the victims of the scheming of others. Certain mighty international forces have rolled their muddy currents through the deeps of the world. Each of these forces aims to obtain full dominion over mankind. It aims to set up a dictatorship of the world.

That is the bare and ugly fact facing us all. Britain has aimed and still aims at freeing the world. She and her "company of nations," her dominions and colonies, have stood as an invincible Gibraltar, squarely in the path of each would-be tyrant; and she has stood there for generation upon generation. Britain therefore stands right in

the course of each of these mighty movements. The captain of each of these movements feels that, with Britain wrecked, his way to world conquest would be clear. Any one who doubts the truth of that solemn statement had better make sure of his facts and details, because he is just mistaken.

What will Canadians do about this matter? On November 12 I proposed in the house that Canada give Britain a line of credit for each of the years 1952, 1953, 1954, 1955 and 1956. Rumours have reached me that some Canadians have begun to talk about opposing such material aid to Britain. I wonder if those Canadians have thought into this problem deeply enough; and I mean any Canadian in Canada, I do not care who he is, or what his language or his belief may be. Let every man in Canada realize that he is jointly responsible with everybody else in Canada for the defence of this nation and the welfare of this nation; and it does not matter what his prejudices are, or who his grandfathers or great-grandfathers were.

At mid-1945 in world war II Britain had in uniform, in the field, in the air and on the sea 5,090,000 men and women. That was with lend-lease and mutual aid in full operation, and of course drawing complete aid from America. As of July 1, 1951, she had 957,000. For that figure I refer hon. members to a pamphlet called "Britain's Defence Effort," issued in July of 1951 by the central office of information at London. The information in question is at page 17.

May I talk to our anti-aid to Britain Canadians for a while. I would talk straight to them, every one of them. Would our anti-aid to Britain Canadians like to see Britain put and keep in the battlelines for freedom over five million fighters, as in world war II; or would they prefer to see Britain keep home four million of those men and women? Or would they still more prefer that Britain be forced to bring home 400,000 of her present 900,000 fighters? That is just exactly what they are asking for when they oppose aid to Britain. The thing would work just as simply as that.

Britain in world war II supplied and threw into freedom's cause prodigious quantities of goods and services. Over and above a general contribution well-nigh incalculable and incomprehensible, Britain contrived to give outright to Russia, and likewise to deliver, vast amounts of supplies. Do our anti-aid to Britain Canadians desire a British performance comparable with that in world war II for world war III, or do they desire that Britain shall be able to produce and put into the conflict far, far less than that?