

two-hundredths of the population of the world, was expected to pay one-thirtieth of the cost, or 3½ per cent. If one wanted a demonstration of the relative ability of one type of economy to serve society, I do not know what better illustration could be found.

Other illustrations could be given also; this one I shall have to take from memory. When the war was over and the rehabilitation of Europe had to be undertaken, the displaced and hungry people had to be fed and broken down economies had to be restored, UNRRA, the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation administration was organized. Thousands of millions of dollars were spent, taken from some countries and spent in others. How were those costs shared? The United States paid 72 per cent of the total cost; the United Kingdom, broken as she is, 18 per cent and Canada, small as she is, 5 per cent. So we had 95 per cent of the cost coming from these three countries and 5 per cent from all the rest. Surely these figures teach us a lesson, and when our type of economy is being challenged they ought to give us some encouragement.

The democracies of the world can serve their respective peoples more effectively than communism serves the Soviet Union, and we must demonstrate that fact to the other nations. The best way to do that is to correct the abuses that give excuse for communism's growth; and when I say that I am talking to our own people. The prevention of war in our lifetime can be achieved if we demonstrate to ourselves and to other nations, if not to Russia, that democracies can serve society better than communism. If we fail to do that, communism will grow and the danger of war increase.

That is the first step toward the prevention of war. But there must be a second defence against war. There must be maintained, preferably by the united nations but if not them by the democracies, adequate means for preventing aggression by any nation, however great. Fortunately plans have been laid in the security council to do that. But unfortunately the security council has not done a very good job so far. In simple language the democracies, by close collaboration with each other, must see to it that their combined strength is such as will deter any aggressor, communist or otherwise, or any combination of communist aggressors, from furthering their ideology by means of war.

The issue is clear as I see it. Non-communist states must serve their people better than communism serves theirs in order to prevent

the expansion of communism—not by calling them names, not by any of the common criticisms which get us nowhere, but by demonstrating to our own society that our type of economy is better.

Non-communist states must keep themselves strong enough to prevent aggression until such time as communist intolerance gives way to tolerance. Let us keep strong in the meantime, hoping that intolerance will give way to tolerance, that there will be room in the world if some countries want communism, to have it, and that there will be room outside where communism need not enter and need not disturb the type of economy which may be desired. In other words we must keep strong enough to prevent aggression until communism, if it continues to exist in Russia, recognizes the right of people of other nations without interference to determine their own type of government and economy.

In the democracies we must win the peace. Neither victory nor peace will come by wishful thinking. They will come only if we pay whatever price it demands. We can win only by making our system fully effective. Effective administration, with the state as the servant, not the master, is the best answer to communism, and therefore the best assurance of peace.

Another paragraph in the address refers to the treaty of peace with Italy, Finland, Roumania, Hungary and Bulgaria. In this connection I do not think the government has tabled the terms of that settlement. If I am correct in that, perhaps the Prime Minister or the Secretary of State for External Affairs will see that it is done.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The treaties have not been signed yet.

Mr. BRACKEN: But they have been agreed to.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is not customary to put treaties before the house until after they have been signed. I think my hon. friend will agree to that.

Mr. BRACKEN: I gather from the Prime Minister's answer that he would prefer not to let us see the terms of the treaty until it is signed.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Oh, not at all. My hon. friend has had the same opportunity I have had to see the terms of the treaty. But the practice is not to table peace treaties until they have been signed; that is the practice in every parliament.

Mr. GRAYDON: It is in the speech from the throne.