

States and Russia. The old European world lies on a bed of suffering and will never recover and last.

And thus, out of the last war have come these two nations, United States and Russia. How strong were they when war was declared in 1939? As to the United States, her armed forces and equipment were about on a par with those of Poland. When Russia was attacked by Hitler's German hordes, she had to go to her knees to save herself; she had to ask help from the United States and Great Britain to halt the German invasion. We may have been wrong in giving Russia that aid, because she has since become a more dreaded menace and threat than our common foe of that time. But facts are facts, and Russia today is a real threat to the whole civilized world.

I do not think figures have ever been published to show the total quantity of munitions, guns, tanks, and general equipment sent by the United States and Great Britain to Murmansk in Russia. In giving this aid, Great Britain deprived herself of equipment which was vital to her own defence, and let us not forget the many lives and vessels that were lost in delivering this equipment.

As to Russia's present exact strength, he certainly would be a genius who could give even an inkling of it. If there is a political iron curtain—and what a splendid appellation Winston Churchill gave it—there is an even thicker iron curtain concealing the progress of Russian armament.

May I digress for one moment? Everyone here knows that during the war hundreds of Sherman tanks were sent to Russia; but perhaps honourable senators have not read what I did about the meeting of the American and Russian armies after the fall of Berlin. A great banquet was held that first night at which twenty-one toasts were drunk, and the following day a memorable parade took place. An American officer was sitting next to a Russian general, and after two or three American infantry regiments had passed by, some Sherman tanks came into view. The Russian general turned to the American and said, "I did not know you had our tanks in your country". Whereupon the American replied, "You did not know that we were making them any more than I knew about your two great generals, General Space and General Winter".

Some Hon. Senators: Oh, oh.

Hon. Mr. David: I say with great respect that the Russian peasants, who fought to safeguard their land, were not fighting for communism, the Kremlin or an ideology. They were fighting for Mother Russia and Mother Volga. History repeats itself. The same

thing happened in 1812 when Napoleon went as far as Moscow only to find the city in flames, and he was forced to retreat among ruins. I am reminded how beautifully this is expressed in that great musical composition of Tschaikovsky, the "1812" overture.

But even admitting that we know little of Russia's strength today, we do know that she rid herself of danger from the two nations of which she was most afraid—on the west, Germany; and, on the east, Japan.

We must also bear in mind that today she dominates one-third of Europe and also a great proportion of Asia. However, according to an article by Lord Robert Cecil, we should not be too pessimistic about the future of China. As I desire not to say anything against the leader of the present Nationalist movement, I suppose I should not quote certain other statements from that article. Besides the territory which she dominates in Europe and Asia, Russia has throughout the world a fifth column, which is a great asset to her.

But what did Britain get in return for the sacrifices she made during the last war? What has she received for all the courage, valour and bravery that she displayed in providing the bulwark of civilization for more than a year? Here are some of the results of the war, for Britain. She lost her naval supremacy. She lost the empire of India, whose 400 millions constitute nearly one-fifth of the total population of the world. She lost her foreign investments. And she has ceased to be the great financial country of the world. It is true that, like a French king of the eleventh or twelfth century, Britain can say, "All is lost except my honour," but the country which at one time stood alone in sustaining the whole weight of the war now witnesses the downfall of her past greatness.

It would be unwise for anyone to try to prophesy what Europe's future will be, but in considering future prospects one should look at the Atlantic Pact, which I believe has been in effect for about one year. It was signed by a number of European and American countries, and perhaps for the time being it might act as a deterrent to any nation contemplating aggression against a signatory of the pact.

But does it provide a guarantee for maintenance of peace in the future? In directing attention to that question I ask for the patience of honourable senators while I point out one or two facts. The government of every country that has signed the agreement remains absolutely free, in case of conflict, to determine what help it will offer to any country that is attacked. Further, every such government is also free in the case of conflict