

ready to deal with this dread possibility. On the other hand and many think that this is the more probable development, the present situation of war without warfare may continue for years. This will confront us with just about the most difficult political and economic problem that has ever faced a democratic society. It is unprecedented and so we have little to go on as we try to work our way through the jungle of the difficulties and dangers of what the London "Economist" calls "three-quarters peace". Certainly we have to become collectively strong in a military sense to meet the shock of a sudden attack; or, and this is more important, to make such an attack unlikely by convincing anyone who contemplates aggression that he has no hope for victory. At the same time, we have to be careful in this country, and in other countries, not to divert to and organize our resources for military defence in such a way or to such an extent that we sap and weaken our economic and social strength and morale. The potential enemy may have decided, and at the moment he has the initiative in this decision, that this war will be one of long drawn-out attrition and hope that we will weaken ourselves for its continuing tests by panic measures and an unbalanced defence. To put it another way, he may decide that this race is not to be a sprint, but a middle, or even a long distance contest. We may have to adapt our tactics accordingly. This will require steadiness and control, a sense of pace, a refusal to be thrown off balance, but, at the same time, a determination to take the necessary steps to cut down the lead which our opponent now has. The present conflict is, in fact, a dual one, and requires dual policies - short term and long term policies - military and civil - which should be complementary and not contradictory. We are faced now with a situation similar in some respects to that which confronted our fore-fathers in early colonial days when they ploughed the land with a rifle slung on the shoulder. If they stuck to the plough and left the rifle at home, they would have been easy victims for any savages lurking in the woods. If they had concentrated on the rifle and forgot about ploughing, the colony would have scattered or died. The same combination is required today, though it is far more difficult to bring about. We must keep on ploughing, harder than ever, while we arm. We will hardly achieve that double objective of government as usual, by business as usual or by life as usual.

These are all generalities, and you have heard them many times before. More important are the practical problems they present to us, one or two of which I would like to mention.

In domestic policy, one of our main problems is to decide what proportion of our resources should be devoted to our own defence, whether that defence takes the form of national action at home or collective action with our friends abroad. There should be no distinction - this time - between them. We should accept without any reservation, the view that the Canadian who fires his rifle in Korea or on the Elbe, is defending his home as surely as if he were firing it on his own soil. There is not likely, certainly, to be unanimous agreement on this question of how much should go now for defence. Some will say that we are actually and completely at war now; that we should base all our policy on that fact; that our military defence efforts should be the same as if the enemy were actually attacking our country; that our economic policy should be based on the same considerations, with complete control of prices and wages and, above all, of manpower for industry or for the armed services. There are others, and the Government shares this view, who feel that any such all-out interference with the mechanism of our economic and political society, at the present time, would weaken, rather than strengthen us - might, indeed, even play into the enemy's hands by making it harder for us to