

much better it would be if Pakistan would permit these agencies to go into that country and to give this kind of aid to innocent victims of the internal conflict.

I am satisfied that this government considers in general that initiatives for improving the effectiveness of the United Nations should be taken within the context of the charter, except when it appears to it that the general consent of the membership could be obtained to secure a charter revision as in the case, for example, of the Economic and Social Council.

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. Cullen: Certainly.

Mr. Allmand: Is the hon. member aware that since I first put my motion on the order paper last fall the United Nations General Assembly voted 82 to 12 in favour of charter review and asked the member countries of the United Nations to submit proposals for charter review by July 1, 1972? Is he aware of that new development since I placed my motion on the order paper?

An hon. Member: That sounds like a set-up.

Mr. Cullen: If it is a set-up, it is a good one and I am happy that the hon. member saw fit to ask the question. I was aware of this particular development but I am sure many people in this country were not, and perhaps many Members of Parliament were not aware of it. I thank the hon. member for highlighting this fact and adding to the calibre of the debate by showing that not only has he brought forward this motion and spoken on it but, he now seeks to ask questions in order to put even more information on the record.

I am satisfied that the government might be prepared to accept the motion in a different form and if some of the specific recommendations were dropped. I for one think that is not very important, but it is important to outline the specific areas in which we feel changes can be made, rather than couching motions in broad generalities, thereby not really striking home at areas where we feel changes should be made. That is, in effect, saying, "Changes should be made but we will not tell you where. We will leave it to the good graces of those who will be making representations".

I think members of this House owe it to the government and the United Nations to point out areas in which they think improvements can be made. Certainly, the United Nations is not above constructive criticism. By making these comments I am not trying to suggest that Canada has been inactive on recommendations contained in the motion; in fact, the opposite is the case.

Unfortunately, time will not permit me to go into too much detail but I think it should be noted that Canada did support a resolution approved by the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly which asked the members of the organization to give their views on ways and means of making the International Court of Justice more effective. My hon. friend who moved this motion has highlighted this area.

Prevention of Military Aggression

On the question of peacekeeping, it seems to me basic to the foreign policy of Canada to work to make the United Nations a more effective instrument for the preservation of vital, international peace and security. It is almost trite to make the comment, but it should be highlighted. No one can dispute that the government supports and is heavily engaged in the special committee on peacekeeping and elsewhere in the effort to develop an effective peacekeeping mechanism which will enhance the ability of the United Nations to fulfil the intentions stipulated in the charter.

In addition to the efforts Canada has expended in the peacekeeping role, I think we can be justifiably proud of our role in promoting economic and social stability. It must be remembered that in this area Canada has played a useful and effective part in helping the United Nations to discharge its crucial responsibilities toward the developing countries. Canada is one of the major contributors to the voluntary economic and technical assistance funds in the United Nations family of organizations. The small amount of research I was able to undertake reveals that our annual contribution to these programs alone is slightly more than \$112 million. I think it also bears repeating that Canada is one of the largest contributors to the World Bank institutions which so effectively serve the interests of the developing countries. A reading of the Right Hon. Lester B. Pearson's comments in "Partners in Development" should be a must for every member of this House.

In conclusion, I extend my thanks and compliments to the mover of the motion because it gives members of this House an opportunity to look outward, to do a bit of thinking and to express their points of view about our continued membership in the United Nations and the role Canada has to play, is playing and will continue to play. It is hoped that as a result of motions such as this the powers that be will see fit to make these kinds of changes—if not all those suggested, at least some that are highlighted.

• (4:20 p.m.)

Mr. Grant Deachman (Vancouver Quadra): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to take part in the debate on this motion. It provides an opportunity for wide ranging debate on a most important topic, that in the opinion of this House the government should take initiatives for United Nations reform. In his motion the mover states:

—reform to make that institution a more effective instrument for the prevention of military aggression, for the settlement of international disputes, and to promote co-operation, peace and prosperity—

There are other items which he mentions. I wish to make particular reference to the wording, "co-operation, peace and prosperity". In paragraph 5 of his motion the hon. member further states:

provide for the establishment of global authorities related to the United Nations to deal with serious global problems such as the environment, population, development of seabed resources, and economic and social stability;

I should like to speak about the item "economic and social stability". In particular I refer to the work of