

"It would probably be the suicide of our civilization." Our best hope at the moment is that—as the responsible authorities feel—the size of our preparations may well deter aggressors for years to come. General Eisenhower recently spoke of the possibility that our efforts to deter war might well last for from twenty-five to thirty years. Then behind our ramparts we can strengthen ourselves morally and economically, help to remove the causes of war by assisting those less fortunate, confident that in due course the ability of the aggressors to make war will wane, and that a new era of peace and prosperity will dawn over a troubled world.

There can be no doubt that the fate of the free world rests largely on the leadership of the countries of the North Atlantic Pact. If they can unite successfully, and stay united with one common purpose and aim throughout the long years that lie ahead, our way of life will survive; if not, the prospect is dark indeed. It was in this spirit and with this idea that we entered into the North Atlantic Pact. The fact remains, however, that there are those on this continent who think otherwise. They would have us, in effect, tear up the North Atlantic Treaty; they would leave Western Europe to its fate; they would have us retire to this continent, confident that here we could enjoy safety, peace and prosperity, indifferent to the fate of mankind elsewhere. For my part, I am firmly opposed to their proposals. Like my honourable friend opposite (Hon. Mr. Haig), I stand foursquare behind the North Atlantic Treaty, and I shall do everything in my power to make it a success. I range myself squarely behind General Eisenhower, who was quoted as having said recently: "There is no acceptable alternative, because standing alone and isolated in a world otherwise completely dominated by communism, our system would have to wither away. We would suffer economic atrophy and then finally collapse."

Difficult as the task is, energetic action in building defences in Western Europe has, it seems to me, an excellent chance of succeeding in deterring aggression for some time at least. We know nothing, of course, of the real plans of communist imperialism. I am prepared to believe that the communists are anxious to accomplish the downfall of the Western world. I can well believe that as a first step they would like to bring all Western Europe under their domination and control. The reserves of manpower, the natural resources and the productive facilities which would thereby be added to their own would completely change the balance of power. If the prospects were that this could be done immediately by armed aggression with little organized resistance, they might well attempt

it at an early date. On the other hand, if they felt they could only win this area after fighting a well organized defence force, it seems to me they would think twice before undertaking it, for even if they overran Western Europe, they would find nothing but a shambles. They are more likely to try other tactics. Their chances of gaining control of it intact without firing a shot are infinitely better.

This, then, is the situation. The United States and we are bound legally—or, should I say, by treaty—as well as morally and by the dictates of common-sense with our partners in Western Europe for our common-self preservation. This is, in effect, union of the new world with the old, and it is not in the interest of Western Europe any more than of ourselves. One half of the union—our half, Canada and the United States—is relatively safe from attack for some time to come. The Western European half is in more immediate danger; but even there, for the reasons I just gave, there may be a considerable respite. Wars and rumours of wars may exist elsewhere, and they are serious, but here the real issue will be joined. If we succeed here, mankind will survive. If we fail, darkness will settle over the earth.

We all should resolve to dedicate our energies, intelligence, patience and good will to the common cause. And, honourable senators, there will be ample opportunities for their use. The problems and difficulties are great, but they can be surmounted. We expect our governments to give definite leadership from time to time, but in democracies that fact does not absolve others, particularly members of parliament from responsibility. A problem of such seriousness and importance as this should have, I believe, our most careful consideration in order that we can contribute as much as possible. First we should take careful note of what we have to work with, appreciate the problems that have to be surmounted, face squarely up to them and, as occasion demands, assist as best we can in solving them.

Now briefly, what have we to work with? Our union—I am using that term at the moment because there is a union of interests—consists of two countries on this continent with a combined population of 165 million, and ten in Western Europe with a combined population of 172 million, a total of 337 million. The national income of the two countries on this continent in 1949 was over \$234 billion, and that of the ten countries in Western Europe about \$73 billion, a total of over \$300 billion. As far as armed manpower is concerned, present plans contemplate that by the end of 1951 the total of men under arms in our half of this union will be not less than 3,500,000 and in the