

can be held. It is true now, as it has been in the past, that wars are won by the man behind the gun. In the last war many people made the mistake of thinking that victory would be achieved by bombing from airplanes, but we now know that the devastation caused in that way was far less extensive than had been anticipated. Cologne, Dresden, Berlin and Hamburg were not blasted to the extent that the public imagined. Cologne was frequently attacked by nine hundred bombers in line, each carrying from four to six tons of bombs; but when the war was over, the people there walked out from their shelters. True, there was considerable slaughter, but far less than had been anticipated. And in the Korean fighting the northern forces, who were expected not to be able to make any advance against our aerial attacks, just kept on going.

I want the government to tell the people what manpower commitments we have made under the North Atlantic Treaty. It is all right for parliament to vote millions of somebody else's money—each one of us thinks it is the other fellow's money, and not our own, that we are spending; but let us not be blind to the fact that Canada, as a signer of the treaty, will be asked to provide fighting men. How are we going to get them? For the life of me, I am unable to say.

One more point. Where are we going to get the money to pay for all these expenditures? The easy way for a government to increase its revenues is to impose new taxes. The present government may fear that heavy taxes would not be popular when it has to face the people three or four years from now. Perhaps there is hope that something may happen to make very heavy additional taxation unnecessary. However, I see no evidence that the government, faced with the need of making these gigantic expenditures for military purposes, has any idea of practising economy in its ordinary services. It is useless to shut our eyes to the fact that since 1939, although our population has not grown greatly, our annual expenditures have increased from \$600 million to \$2,400 million. Someone said the other day that the province of Ontario, with a population of four and a half million, has 12,500 civil servants, but there are twice as many administering the 45,000 members of the armed forces in Canada. And we are paying the shot. The income tax cannot be raised much higher. The government could get some money by confiscation, by a capital levy, but whatever sums it collected in that way could be got only once. If we are going to make these war expenditures, the government will have to economize or Canada will go bankrupt.

One policy that the government followed after the close of the last war I hope will not be followed again. It had on hand many millions of dollars' worth of goods which it had to dispose of at fire-sale prices.

Hon. Mr. Horner: It only thought it had to sell them.

Hon. Mr. Haig: I do not know what it thought, but at any rate it sold them, because it did not think the so-called "cold war" would develop as it has. But the government should not have been surprised by what Russia has done. As pointed out the other day by the honourable senator from New Westminster (Hon. Mr. Reid)—I agree with a good deal of what he said—the Russians of today are the same as the Russians of the past. Although they have a new boss in place of the Tsar, our government should have known that they still dream of conquering the world and will try to make their dream a reality.

I am going to vote for this bill for the same reason that I voted for various war-time appropriation bills submitted to us from 1939 to 1945. On a number of occasions when I concurred in the appropriation of \$100 million or \$200 million or more, for war supplies, I wondered whether there would not be a lot of goods on hand at the end of the war and a heavy loss on the sale of them. I have a similar wonder now, but I do not want anyone to be able to say to me, "You refused to vote money for the proper equipment of our soldiers, and when they met the Russians in battle"—as they will have to do—"they were not prepared to fight them on equal terms." Nevertheless the onus on the government today is heavier than it has ever been. We well remember what happened at the end of the recent war, when piles of supplies and equipment all over this country were disposed of. The liquidating of war assets should not be our policy in the future. The taxes the people of this country are paying are as high as most of us believe they can pay. The government saw fit before the last election to cut income taxes all it could, and now it points to the fact that the recent budget does not put those taxes up again. Well, I wish the government would promise me that it will not in the next budget increase income taxes again.

As this bill is for the granting of war supplies, I cannot refuse to vote for it. But when we come down to a consideration of the sacrifice of human life, money is not the most important thing. I want to know what is going to be the policy of the government with regard to its commitments under the Atlantic Charter. It has been said that we