

Supply—National Defence

With regard to our own defence, we believe that, given conditions as they are at the present time, we have enough forces to deal with any situation that might arise here. The only other point, then, is this: Is the amount of \$425 million that we are spending on defence enough to enable us to see that we carry our fair share of the load under the North Atlantic treaty? It is the belief of this government that it is enough, and that it is a proper proportion. In proportion to population, on a per capita basis, it is more than any other country of the British commonwealth is spending, except the United Kingdom; and on a per capita basis I believe it is more than any other country under the North Atlantic treaty is spending, except the United States and the United Kingdom.

On other bases of comparison, it is more than a good many of the countries concerned are spending, either as a proportion of national product or as a percentage of national budget, although some of the countries of Europe are spending more. But when we include with the \$425 million some of the other items that might properly be allocated to defence under the accounting systems in force in one or other countries—such as, for example, married quarters built for defence personnel by Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation; some part of the cost of civil aviation and navigational aids; some part of the cost of the R.C.M.P., and one or two other similar matters—the figure can be built up to something over \$500 million. The other expenditures to which I have referred are not made in the Department of National Defence; they are made by other departments. The only amount we can spend this year is \$425 million. But having regard to our resources, our needs, our capacities and our responsibilities, we believe that on any basis the amount we are spending today represents a fair contribution towards collective security.

Mr. Green: There is one question I wish the Minister of National Defence would deal with today, namely, whether he believes the events which are happening now in Korea call for any change in the plans of the Department of National Defence of Canada. From his remarks thus far this morning I take it that he believes these events do not require any change in Canada's policy, and with all my heart I hope that he is correct. But it does seem to me that the potentialities of this unprovoked attack, obviously instigated by the U.S.S.R., are very serious, and that they may well be more serious for Canada than for any other country in the world.

I should like to know whether the minister believes that Canada should take any action, in view of this step taken today, which seems to make the cold war a very hot one. I heard the announcement on the radio this morning at nine o'clock that the United States commander in Alaska had alerted his fighting squadrons there. The report went on to say that this was a routine order, and it may have been; but surely Canada cannot afford to take chances.

I should like to know whether Canada is in a position to put fighter squadrons into action in the northwestern part of our territory on short notice; whether we are in a position to protect our airfields in northwestern Canada, should an attempt be made to seize them; and whether we are in a position to put a coastal patrol over the Pacific coast, to protect that coast against hostile submarines.

In his remarks in the last few minutes the minister emphasized time and again Canada's obligations under the North Atlantic treaty. He said that if we were spending more money for defence it would probably best be spent in providing equipment to other nations who have signed the North Atlantic treaty. Mr. Chairman, the North Atlantic treaty does not apply in any way whatever to this trouble in Korea. I read now from the preamble of the treaty. Referring to the nations who signed the treaty it says:

They seek to promote stability and well-being in the north Atlantic area.

They are resolved to unite their efforts for collective defence and for the preservation of peace and security.

They therefore agree to this North Atlantic treaty.

In article 5 we find that there is no obligation whatever upon any nation party to this treaty to come to the aid of another nation if the attack comes in the Pacific. The article reads:

The parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all.

But if trouble comes, if this is the beginning of a hot war that we are having today, then an attack will certainly be made across from Siberia into Alaska and into northwestern Canada, and Edmonton, for example, which is the most exposed city, would almost certainly be bombed without warning if the hostile planes could not be stopped. I am afraid that the minister is placing too much emphasis on the North Atlantic treaty and on the north Atlantic where we have the Russians stopped, and is paying no attention, or very little, to this grave development across the Pacific. I would ask him to let us