

we have bound ourselves together. How successful or effective this pact may be remains to be seen. My honourable friend opposite has referred to the proposal made by Canada at the United Nations that member countries agree to make their combined armed forces available for the repelling of aggression in any part of the world. As he said, that suggestion was opposed by Russia and fell by the wayside. Specifically, what we have in its place for purposes of collective security is the undertaking of those countries bordering the North Atlantic to build up their armed forces in an endeavour to be ready to meet just such a challenge as is now presented in Korea.

In the face of Russia's right to veto, how the United Nations will undertake to give effect to the desire expressed by the other countries for combined effort against aggression, I do not know. I assume that the Assembly will try to reach some formula for avoiding this obvious difficulty and others. It will undoubtedly be the will of all the countries except Russia to make their united strength available for fighting aggression, and I hope means will be found to prevent Russia from frustrating that will. The pact made by the North Atlantic countries, in which Canada is included, continues in force, and I have no doubt that as time goes on we shall be given further information as to what plans are being laid for defence.

I was much interested in the passionate attack made by the leader opposite (Hon. Mr. Haig) upon the government because of rising prices, and I presume he wished to imply that controls should be reimposed. But I have a distinct recollection of listening in this house to eloquent appeals by himself and his colleague from Blaine Lake (Hon. Mr. Horner) for discontinuance of government controls, "now that the war is over," in order that the law of supply and demand might be able to operate again and cause prices to come down. If they did not describe the government as iniquitous for having brought controls into being, they at least attacked it for continuing them, and argued that there should no longer be interference with the ordinary effect of competition on the prices of goods. But at this session our honourable friends have made an almost frantic appeal for resumption of government controls. In so doing they have paid the government a high compliment. I fancy that the leader of the opposition was happy that it was not the responsibility of the opposition to bring down legislation, for the problem of dealing with prices was not an easy one. He certainly was not right in his forecast that the problem would be settled if the laws of supply and demand were allowed to

operate freely. And now there is, as I say, this appeal, which perhaps in the circumstances is a natural one, to have controls put on again.

Hon. Mr. Haig: Just a minute. I never urged that controls be put on again. I asked what the government policy was.

Hon. Mr. Robertson: My honourable friend's memory of what he said is probably right. However, he wanted the government to do something. It is a very subtle point.

Hon. Mr. Haig: No. I asked you what the government's policy was.

Hon. Mr. Robertson: My honourable friend used to argue that if the government stopped doing certain things, everything would be all right; but now he says that everything would be all right if the government did something. I believe he is as much in error now as he was when insisting upon his demand that controls be removed.

I do not think I need to remind this house that the primary reason for calling this special session of parliament was the worsening of the international situation. It is true that the opening date was advanced somewhat because of the railway strike, but I have no doubt that the difficulty of effecting a settlement of that strike in the final hours of negotiation was attributable in some degree, at least indirectly, to the difficulties brought about by the Korean war, the workers perhaps fearing that a largely increased demand for many goods by people trying to safeguard themselves against shortages in the event of an extended conflict might start an upward spiral in prices. So from that point of view it can still be said that the worsening international situation was the primary reason for calling this session.

The leader opposite has pointed out that the government, through an appropriation bill which is already before the other house, will be asking for specific sums of money. Last session the vote for defence was approximately \$425 million, with authorization for another \$190 million for forward commitments. My honourable friend reminded us that in committee a certain item, which perhaps should have been properly charged to defence, was found to be under another head—I think it was housing. The Appropriation Bill introduced at this session calls for a direct appropriation of \$142 million for defence, plus \$300 million for the supplying of armaments to our allies overseas. The government is seeking authorization for future commitments of an additional \$409 million, and a further amount of more than \$5 million is required for defence research, plus an extra \$2 million, which may not be