

Supply—National Defence

the determination that by courage and devotion to the principles we know to be right, we shall win through to a better world and a better life.

Mr. Blair: Mr. Chairman, when the defence estimates were being considered last September, I brought this matter of civil defence to the attention of the committee. At that time I made it clear that there was no desire to alarm the population of this country, but at the same time we should make plans. Since that time, I have been very much disturbed, especially the other night when I read a speech made by General Worthington concerning this matter. I am going to read some of it into the record, because I think we have to adopt a position that is absolutely clear. Either it is worth while doing something about this now or, as the minister has said, we might delay doing something about it until there was an actual state of war. I quote now from a press dispatch in the *Ottawa Journal* of May 7 what that distinguished soldier Major General Worthington said about it in a speech on V-E day at Aylmer:

... The General said there was no place on this continent which was not subject to invasion. In a future war America would not be protected by the barriers of two oceans and an Arctic icecap.

"Today the front line is your own front yard," he said. He warned that the method of warfare now was to smash at the civil population in order to disrupt the home front and the productive capacity of a nation.

General Worthington said the civilian population would need to be trained to know what to do in the event of invasion to minimize the effect on morale and production.

Sir, if there was anything further that was needed to cause alarm, it was an article appearing on May 8, generally carried by the press throughout Canada but which I happened to see in the *Toronto Telegram*. It carries the headline, "War Means A-Bombs Wipe Out U.S. Cities; Truman Raps MacArthur." We are not going to bring the MacArthur affair into this discussion. We are concerned about what Truman said concerning the possibility of warfare on this continent. The article reads:

Washington, May 8. President Truman told the United States last night an atomic war with Russia is "a real possibility," but it would be more likely under the policies of General Douglas MacArthur.

Mr. Truman said atomic warfare might wipe out some of the major cities of the U.S., and "I do not want to be responsible for bringing that about."

Further on in the same article he states:

"The thing that is at stake in this debate may be atomic war. Our foreign policy is not a political issue. It is a matter of life and death. It is a matter of the future of mankind."

I again say that we should either seriously consider this matter or say that it is

[Mr. Martin.]

a matter we may delay until something really does happen. I say to the minister that the age of delay is gone as certainly as the age of chivalry. Certainly, our United States friends found that out at Pearl Harbor. Nations today do not bother declaring war or giving a month's or two months' notice that they are going to make war. Possibly the last time this custom was followed was at the battle of Fontenoy, where the French said "English gentlemen, fire first." I have quoted these two authorities, Major General Worthington, the present head of the civil defence body of Canada, and the president of a great country like the United States, who have said definitely that this type of war is a possibility and may occur. It would appear to me that in this matter we are sitting on a bomb. If anything further was needed to cause alarm so far as I was concerned, it was the speech by the minister which has been referred to in the house several times, in which he attempted to whip some white fighting fury into a group gathered for a course up at Connaught Ranges. While the minister may have been misquoted, there was no doubt whatever of the result, because the heading in the *Ottawa Journal* whips up fury against the Soviet threat; and I may tell the minister that I am all for it. But I was amazed that a placid man like the minister can be whipped into such a fighting fury that he came out with words of this type. The speech goes down as one of the great fighting speeches in history.

An hon. Member: Fighting Paul.

Mr. Blair: It was something like that of Henry V before the battle of Harfleur in which he said:

Once more unto the breach, dear friends, once more;

Or close the wall up with our English dead.

History is full of great quotations like that. But today the minister comes up with another calm speech. He seems to be in varying moods in regard to this matter since he has joined the martial branch of the Department of National Health and Welfare. Today he comes up with a long speech on organization; it was a most quiet one, and he spoke in just about the way that you would plan out a campaign for something that you were going to do across Canada with regard to a welfare project. But two days before he was simply fighting. Possibly he looked at these people gathered out at Connaught Ranges and said to himself: "These people have just come in for a course; they are not too greatly interested". Then he ranged forth with this "every man must do his duty" sort of thing. I am not criticizing