

*Supply—External Affairs*

order to prove that what you are saying will be matched by what you are doing, you should carry out the principles which you accepted in paragraph 3 of the Atlantic charter. You should give to the peoples under your control the right to decide for themselves the form of government they will have.

Khrushchev has placed communist control on the horns of a dilemma. If in carrying out his avowed principles a small measure of freedom is granted to the people who are today subjected, then those people will ask for more and communist rule will be in danger. If, on the other hand, those subjected people are denied any further measure of freedom, then bitter resentments will ultimately bring about outbreaks of violence similar to those that have occurred in recent months.

Then, sir, it appears to me that if Khrushchev means what he says, should he not at this time, and should not Bulganin in association with him, grant to the people in slave camps, grant to those who have been the subject of mass deportation, the freedom which Khrushchev, Shepilov and Bulganin avowed in such eloquent terms? I cannot believe that the present leaders of the Kremlin are sincere when all they do is condemn Stalin but accept the benefits that flow from the tyrannical practices of Stalin. They renounce what he did but they keep what he illegally got. To renounce wrongdoing, the wrongdoing of the thief and the plunderer, and to keep the bounty which was the result of that wrongdoing, does not carry with it a sense of conviction of repentance for wrongdoing and a desire for a better life.

Then, sir, I should like to have heard the minister deal as well with the concept which particularly is being adopted by the United States and also by Britain, namely, the expansion of economic assistance to the underdeveloped countries, economic assistance comprised within the broader concepts of defence. As the president of the United States has said, every dollar we put into this kind of thing, if it is intelligently spent, is to my mind in the long run worth every \$5 we are putting into shared defence because, in the long run, it is a constructive thing. What consideration is being given of a reassessment of the question of the amount that should be spent on tanks, guns and ships and the amount that should be made available for underdeveloped countries?

I am not thinking of the kind of policy, however, that makes promises and does not carry them out or makes promises of economic assistance based on the tractability of the receiving nations. One of the reasons for the Suez situation today is the fact that the

United States made certain promises, in which Britain co-operated to a degree, of assistance, fearing apparently that the U.S.S.R. was going to grant a large amount of assistance to Egypt. The promise was made but it was not kept for reasons that were given some two weeks ago. Then the nature of the U.S.S.R. policy of blackmail became apparent, for the U.S.S.R. reneged on its promises which indeed had caused in large measure the promises of assistance made by the United States. I am not speaking of assistance based on the need of the receiver to accede to the political philosophies of the free world but assistance to raise the standard, and without strings.

I should like to ask the minister to outline, if he will in reply, whether there has been a degree of unified policy between Britain, the United States, France and the other nations in this regard, for certainly the U.S.S.R. is striding across the world today, amongst the underdeveloped countries in particular, and with promises of economic assistance is asking those countries in effect to trade their freedom for a generation for the security of today.

Those are but a few matters that I thought I would bring before the committee at this time. I feel that Canada's position in the world in which we live might be one far beyond its economic power and population. Disarmament conferences there have been, although they are postponed now apparently until after the United States election. Peace and its achievements should not be dependent upon or suspended by elections in any of the free nations, as I see it. Be that as it may, free men today must not weary. All of us must endeavour to do our part to achieve a climate of peace, maintain our strength and practise the principles in which we believe. We should make democracy work in our own midst and in the market places of world competition, the competition of co-existence, be able to show that our product is better than theirs. That is our responsibility in the long run. In the shorter view, it is to preserve peace by the maintenance of our defences, by the realization of what freedom means and at the same time by doing our part to be sure that those nations behind the iron curtain, who love freedom as we love freedom, have not been and will not be forgotten.

**Mr. Stewart (Winnipeg North):** Mr. Chairman, it is quite obvious that what is uppermost in the minds of members of parliament and, I should imagine, in the minds of a vast majority of the population, is what is the goal of the U.S.S.R., what is the meaning in the changes which have taken place there?