

spending well over \$1 billion a year. How far can we go in maintaining these services, and at the same time meet the huge expenditures needed to cope with the most vital question that concerns us? The old-age pension or the family allowance is not of much value to a man if in the end, he loses his freedom, liberty and right of self-government. That is the great issue at stake today in the gigantic struggle which is taking place throughout the world. It is not so much a test between East and West as a test between two vital concepts of life. On the one hand is the opportunity for man to achieve self-development in all possible directions, so long as he does not injure his neighbours; and on the other hand is the possibility that he will become a slave and a mere cog in the vast mechanism of government in a police state. That is the issue at stake, and it is with the hope of preserving peace in the end that the freedom-loving nations are girding on their armour against the powers of darkness.

This is going to cost us dearly, and so I should like the Canadian people to become more aware of these important issues. Let us not deceive ourselves. The highest possible sacrifice may be asked of every Canadian, but I am sure that if our people become clearly aware of the real issues they will, as ever in the past, rise to the needs of the hour. I am convinced that every thinking Canadian will make this sacrifice because more than anything else he values the right to live his own life, free from the interference of any aristocratic government which may try to impose itself upon him.

Honourable senators, I support this bill unreservedly. I feel confident that the government will use its utmost wisdom to see that value is secured for whatever money it spends. I hope that every Canadian legislative body, seeing the trouble which rises before us, will reduce to a minimum the ordinary costs of administration so that more of our national income may be directed to meeting the costs outlined in this bill and which—make no mistake about it—will increase in the future.

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

Hon. Arthur W. Roebuck: Honourable senators, may I highly commend the honourable gentleman from Churchill (Hon. Mr. Crerar) for the eloquent words he has just spoken about the preservation of liberty and freedom of our Canadian people. I was particularly struck by his reference to the possibility of our citizens becoming, as he put it, cogs in the mechanism of government. That is something of which we must be eternally aware. We do not want our citizens to

become mere flies on some great governmental wheel, and for this reason I think it is worth while for me to take just a moment of your time to sound a note of warning about this matter of police.

The bill before us provides for an appropriation of \$2 million for the maintenance of a police force for the provinces of British Columbia and Newfoundland. The amount involved is not large; I am more concerned about the tendency than about the event. I suppose that if these two provinces wish to enter into an agreement with the federal government about police financing I should have no objection, but I wish to call the attention of all thoughtful people to the tendency involved. When I was Attorney-General of Ontario, I introduced a bill to establish a central police office or clearing house for the various police forces of the province. This bill was attacked by the Conservatives on the grounds that it would centralize all police power in the hands of one man, the Attorney-General of the province. Following a debate of two or three days I withdrew my bill because of the opposition's attack. It is true that I was able to argue that in this instance the centralization of the police forces had no ulterior or sinister purpose, and that it might well bring about greater efficiency in the policing of the province; nevertheless, I withdrew my bill following the strong arguments put forth by the opposition.

The leader of the government (Hon. Mr. Robertson) has pointed out that the provinces will not be able to fully meet the cost of the services to be rendered to them by the R.C.M.P. Thus, I take it, the good citizens of these provinces, in order to save a few dollars and perhaps improve their police system, are transferring a certain power which was placed in their hands by the Fathers of Confederation. I have mentioned two good arguments in favour of centralizing the control of police forces, but I have an abiding faith in the local police forces—

Hon. Mr. Reid: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Roebuck:—just as I have in local school trustees who are close to their people.

Efficiency is not necessarily the last word in police administration. Sometimes the fanatical and over-efficient policeman is most dangerous, and not infrequently the easy-going policeman is the better of the two. I favour the man who knows his people, who feels that his control is close to him, and who acts in accordance with the sentiment of the small community in which he operates. Local control which is in tune with those who suffer under the authorities, is a consideration far superior to efficiency or the saving of a little money. I do hope that my province of Ontario will never enter into