

the great powers to do something it did not think should be done in the interests of world peace. That is why the five great powers were given the veto right. At that time an alternative suggestion was made to the effect that certain powers should be given more votes than others in the deliberations of the General Assembly or the Security Council, but this proposal was not accepted.

In June 1950 the Russian representative was absent from the meetings of the Security Council of the United Nations, and when the Korean situation arose the attending delegates authorized the United Nations to go to war to try and stop the aggressors. I think everyone knows that if Russia had been represented at those meetings of the Security Council there would have been no such action. The Russians would have vetoed it. This was proven just recently when the Russian delegates vetoed every move that would hinder the Northern Koreans. A day or two ago the Security Council members voted seven to one in favour of adopting a certain measure, but Russia used her veto power to block it. If this is the true picture of either the Security Council or the General Assembly, I think the United Nations fails to fulfil its real purpose. I do say, however, that the United Nations meetings have proven to the world just where the Russians stand, and that they could never be educated in any other way.

I am glad that the government has again adopted the policy of sending members of the opposition parties to the meetings of the United Nations. When I attended the council meetings I learned that Russia's real attitude was to make use of the slightest pretext and do everything she could to block any action being taken by the United Nations. Let me give you an illustration of what I mean. The United Nations Charter provides that when certain committees are to be formed there is to be a meeting. For instance, it took fifteen meetings to elect the International Court. Then the question arose whether the members of that court had been legally appointed, because the charter provides that they be appointed at a meeting. So the General Assembly asked the Committee on Legal Affairs, which is one of the standing committees, to define the word "meeting". Fifty-one representatives, including Russia's, discussed this question from 3 o'clock in the afternoon until about seven at night. By that time we unanimously agreed—and I may say to my honourable friend from Blaine Lake (Hon. Mr. Horner) that we were all lawyers—what the definition should be. The next day the minutes came up for ratification and were read by the secretary. The Russian representative who had agreed to the minutes the day before had been replaced, and his successor took forty-eight minutes to tell us that

the minutes as read by the secretary did not represent what the committee had agreed upon. It took fifty minutes to translate his speech into French and forty-five minutes to translate it into English, and we had to sit and listen all afternoon to his tirade. Then the United States delegate moved that four words be struck out and replaced by four other words. This was done to clarify the text and not to change its meaning. This motion was seconded by the delegate from the United Kingdom, and after further discussion a vote was finally taken. I had been very active in the drafting of the definition of "meeting", and my advisers, whom the Canadian government always supplies to its delegates, suggested that I should vote against the amendment. They said to me, "You were active in writing the definition so you should vote for it as originally drafted. So I voted with the Russians and her six satellites, and the vote carried thirty-seven to eight. The Byelorussians, or White Russians, sat next to us, and one of their delegates turned to me and said, "My God, you voted against the United Kingdom". I did not know whether he could understand English so, turning to his interpreter, I said: "Tell your friend that we in Canada never vote for the United Kingdom or the United States or any other country which we consider to be taking a wrong action. We vote for the side that we think is right." Luckily for me, the United States was on the same side as we were. I tell that story to point up the fact that after we had unanimously come to an agreement there was a deliberate blockade by the Russians. It is hard to believe that such a thing could happen, but the record proves that it did.

I am one of those who think we should continue to support the United Nations. I have been frank to admit the difficulties facing the organization, but I still think that if we avoid war—I am afraid we shall not—the common sense of the Russian people will in time assert itself and that they will be just as active as we in trying to maintain a forum—whether it be known as the United Nations or by some other name—where the people of the world can discuss their problems. I know that in this house one sometimes changes his views because of some point brought out in a debate. When you hear the other fellow's side you sometimes say to yourself, "I did not think of that point, and there is something to it."

Now I pass on to a criticism of the government. Regardless of what my honourable friend from Carleton (Hon. Mr. Fogo) says, the people of Canada know that since 1945 we have spent \$1½ billion for military purposes, but that on the 14th of July, when the United Nations asked us to send some ground forces to Korea, we were unable to do so. We