

hand or unreasoning panic on the other, we shall become, and deserve to become, slaves ourselves.

May I end with a paragraph from a magazine often quoted in this house and elsewhere, namely, *The Economist*. Writing on January 20 last, the editor said:

Nothing is certain about the course of events in 1951; and anyone who questions this should ask himself frankly what he was prophesying for 1950 just a year ago. The die is not cast for war or peace; events can still be controlled and minds influenced, but only if the leaders of the Kremlin can be convinced that they have equally little to hope from pressing an armed attack on the free world or to fear from withholding it. Neither strength alone nor peace alone is an adequate cry for the west—neither rearmament alone, which is the means of the one, nor negotiation alone which is the means of the other. The only hopeful policy is peace through strength, arms and diplomacy.

Mr. George H. Hees (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, first of all I should like to congratulate sincerely the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Pearson) on a very clear and straightforward statement of the situation today. I feel that we always get the facts from the Secretary of State for External Affairs. I should like to congratulate him on a clear address today.

Last June, when the Secretary of State for External Affairs returned from a meeting of the Atlantic pact nations, he outlined to this house the principle which had been accepted by that body. It was to the effect that in future member nations would not be permitted time to build up their defences behind the bulwarks of overrun nations. The understanding arrived at by the twelve member nations was that they would build up their armed forces now so that they would be able to come immediately to the aid of a member nation should that nation be attacked. That decision was roundly applauded by those in this house and throughout the country. It seemed that at last the free nations of the world were going to take practical steps to combat aggression.

Let us see what we have done during the intervening eight months to implement the decision arrived at at that time. Today our armed forces total 62,000, and the target we have set for ourselves is 69,000. How does this effort compare with that of our two closest and greatest allies, Great Britain and the United States? Our forces, compared to theirs, should be in direct proportion to population. In other words, because the population of Great Britain is three and one-half times that of Canada, the size of their armed forces should be approximately three and one-half times those of Canada. In the same way, because the population of the United States is

eleven times our population, the size of their armed forces should be approximately eleven times greater than ours.

How do they actually compare?

First of all, I shall refer to Great Britain. Last October the armed forces of Great Britain totalled 1,023,000 men. On January 1 of this year our armed forces totalled 62,000. The armed forces of Great Britain are sixteen times greater than ours, instead of three and a half times greater, as they should be in proportion to population. Therefore their effort is four and one-half times greater than ours.

The target set in the United States for the end of June in this year is to have 3,500,000 men under arms. Our ceiling is 69,000. Therefore their target is fifty times that of Canada, instead of eleven times, as it should be in proportion to population. We see therefore that the effort of our two closest and greatest allies is in each case four and one-half times our effort, having taken full consideration of the difference in population of those two great countries and Canada.

Why is there such a great difference in national effort? The Prime Minister speaking in London on January 10 made the following statement:

The north Atlantic countries must build up their military resources to prevent a world war by removing the prospect of successful aggression.

Is the performance I have just outlined the Prime Minister's idea of building up our military resources and playing our part to prevent a third world war? Great Britain and the United States face exactly the same problems we face in raising armed forces. All three countries must produce war materials both for themselves and for their allies, and in addition maintain the production of their civilian goods. In those two countries, as well as in Canada, they enjoy full employment. In those countries they have no extra men to put into their armed forces, any more than we have. Their problems are exactly the same as ours; and therefore there is absolutely no excuse for our not matching their efforts in proportion to population.

Does the government believe that we can enter into associations such as the United Nations and the Atlantic pact and not bear our share of the responsibilities involved? Judging by their action, or lack of action, apparently they do. A parasite has been aptly described as one who goes through a swinging door on somebody else's push. If the government believes that we can go through this period of preparedness, or a third world war, if one should come, on