

Supply—National Defence

course realize that the arrangements which were worked out in connection with the North Atlantic pact took a good deal of time and preparation and careful negotiation among all the governments. All the governments concerned with the arrangement were unanimous as to how the matter should be dealt with. We have not that situation in the Pacific. It is true that some countries in the Pacific would welcome the same kind of regional defensive system—

Mr. Green: Which ones, may I ask?

Mr. Pearson: The hon. member mentioned Australia and New Zealand this morning. I am aware that statements have been made by representatives of the government of Australia which would indicate support for some kind of Pacific defensive alliance or Pacific pact. The position in New Zealand is not yet quite as definite, and even in the case of Australia I would point out it has been indicated that a general Pacific defensive pact of the type we have in the north Atlantic might not be the most suitable at this time for that area, because there are certain countries which have already indicated that they would not be able to participate at this time in that kind of general, if I may call it that, regional collective system. The United States has taken that position; India has taken that position; the United Kingdom has taken that position.

The most recent statement I have seen which was made by the minister for external affairs in Australia seemed to visualize a narrower form of defensive system, where certain states in the Pacific agree among themselves that attack on one would be attack on the others. But then you get in the position of excluding from that arrangement certain other states which might wish to come into the system. So the situation is not nearly as clear-cut as it is in the case of the countries in the north Atlantic area.

I should like to repeat however that this does not mean that we are not aware of the importance of collective defensive measures in the Pacific just as we are in the north Atlantic. We are also quite aware that developments in the Pacific at this time centring around Korea might make this a most realistic matter for consideration.

Mr. Low: Mr. Chairman, I was not able to be here before one o'clock, because there was a committee meeting which I had to attend, but I am advised that in replying to questions asked by the hon. member for Broadview the minister stated, or rather left the impression with the committee, that he required something in the neighbourhood of \$200 million more to make it possible for him

to build adequate defences for Canada. I am not sure that that is the exact implication of his words, but at any rate it was something of the kind. The impression was left by the minister's words that parliament had refused to grant the minister sufficient funds so that he could be prepared.

If those things are true, I should like to ask the minister to tell this committee just who it is that has refused to give him enough funds so that he can adequately prepare the defences of this country. I should like him also to tell hon. members whether or not he has asked parliament for sufficient funds to prepare the defences of this country. I may be misinformed, but if I am not, there is just one thing I should like to have clear. If parliament has ever been asked for an additional \$200 million, or any other sum, for the purpose of preparing adequate defences for our country at this time, then I can assure him it is not the Social Credit group that has refused it. I think it should be made known whether it is treasury board or any group in this house that has done so. What we of the Social Credit group are trying to keep in our minds so far as the defence of Canada is concerned is not so much what it will cost us to defend ourselves at the moment, but what it will cost us if we do not prepare our defences as they ought to be prepared.

I think we all recall what happened the last time that hostilities broke out, how ill-prepared we were, and how difficult it had been to jar loose the government of the day to spend more money on defence preparations, or anything else for that matter in order to move things along even in the economic field. Having in mind the present situation in Korea and southeastern Asia, where anything could develop quickly, I am wondering whether the minister and his department are going to be strangled by our being so niggardly as to refuse them what they require to make certain that we are not caught in the same position as that in which we found ourselves in 1939.

I think the minister and the government know the position that we take with regard to the provision of sufficient funds at any time to take care of our needs. We have always been mindful of the taxpayers, just as treasury board has been, but we have looked at the business of finance quite differently. I want the minister to know that even now, with all the money he is preparing to spend for defence, we have not yet begun to realize anything like our potential of production. If we have not, all that is required is the complete stimulation of development in the field of production to get what he needs. The Social Credit group urge the