

The Address—Mr. Drew

be shattered at any moment by any rash decision, such as that which was made by Hitler in 1939. There are, however, two reasons of great importance why Stalin may not follow the same course, particularly when he remembers what happened to the man whose friendship he embraced in 1939 when he signed an agreement in terms of blood with Hitler in August of that year.

First is the fact that Stalin and the Russian leaders know that every city in Russia is within bombing range of bombs far more deadly and destructive than those which terminated the war with Japan in a matter of days. Russian armies might move forward, but their bases of supply would be destroyed and armies would become mere masses of hungry, fighting men, forced to prey upon the countryside. It would be a terrible prospect for the countries invaded by Russian armies, but it would be an equally terrible prospect for the people of Russia, and above all for the communist leaders, whose survival depends upon their ability to maintain organized military power.

The Russians suffered terrible losses in men and material against an enemy which possessed neither the aircraft nor the bombs to inflict even one-thousandth of the destruction which would now desolate the whole of Russia if they should be so unwise as to precipitate a holocaust of that kind. It would be a terrible war for the West, but it would be more terrible for the East. As long as Stalin and his associates retain any measure of sanity, the dreadful consequences of aggression may stay their hand.

The other reason that there is hope lies in the fact that Russia has achieved so much without war that she may still hope to achieve the objective of world domination, and the objective is nothing less, by the breaking apart of the nations of the free world. Unfortunately, there are unhappy indications that they are not without some reason to hope that this may happen at some time.

On either of these grounds there is hope for peace if the strength of the free nations is built up so rapidly and so effectively that even without the atom bomb, or any other bomb, Russia would not dare aggression. The hope of peace, however, is not based upon any lessening danger, but rather upon the increased danger of prospects so terrifying that the Russians themselves would not be prepared to accept the consequences of starting such a war.

Canadians are I am sure all ready to pay the taxes that are really necessary to defend our freedom. In spite of every argument that has been placed before the government, in

this house and outside, the government still continues, however, not only to impose extremely heavy taxation, but also to over-tax the people far above the amount actually authorized by parliament. Only last Friday it was announced that with certain reductions the surplus to the end of the last month amounted to \$287,932,000. This amounts to nearly \$20 in overtaxation for every man, woman and child in Canada. It means \$100 for the head of a family of five in overtaxation, over and above the heavy taxes our people are already called upon to pay.

The government continues to refer to this surplus as though it were something in the nature of a surplus earned by a business of some kind and did in fact reflect some measure of business efficiency. A surplus earned by a producer is indeed a sign of good business. But this surplus does not come from production of that kind. It comes from the pockets of the taxpayers and from no other source. Every cent of that means overtaxation above and beyond taxes which the people already find far too heavy. It is no answer to say that surpluses of that kind are used to reduce debt. Certainly, if the government decides that it is a good thing to reduce debt, let them say so, and let them place before this house their estimate of the debts they propose to reduce; but if it is not the intention of the government to do this, then the government has no right to deliberately overtax for the purpose of finding money to reduce taxation if that in fact is their intention.

Apart from overtaxation, there is the heavy weight of taxation which many Canadians do not believe to be necessary for the real business of the country. The moment this statement is made there are those who immediately say "Well, do you want to cut down defence spending, or are you suggesting that you curtail social services?" That is a tawdry and time-worn attempt to divert attention from the real suggestion that has been made in this house over and over again. No one is suggesting the cutting down of social services. They are part of the social development of this country. Every party has supported them. To suggest that they are peculiarly the product of one party is an insult to the parliament of Canada and to the provincial parliaments within whose field of jurisdiction most of these subjects lie, and is also a cynical misrepresentation of the facts. In the 85 years since Canada became a nation the two major parties which have shared the responsibility of government for almost exactly the same number of years have each in turn interpreted the changing trend of social development and with the support of parliament have given effect to the will of the