

*Supply—External Affairs*

as investment is concerned in those areas of the Northwest Territories controlled by this nation, we had the law changed so that none but Canadians could take out mining licences, licences for oil and the like. If there was development, 50 per cent had to be made available to Canadians. It was said at that time that this would kill United States investment in Canada. As a matter of fact, there was a tremendous expansion of investment in those areas. I ask the government to give an explanation for this document, issued only two days ago, a document which disposes of all the froth of the argument that the present government has the answers in Canadian-United States relations.

I turn to the other organization in which we have membership, the United Nations. The minister paid a most eloquent tribute to the United Nations, and rightly so. He told us about the development which has taken place, about the expansion which has been witnessed; how all Canadians had hoped this institution would be all-embracing. I am not sure what the membership is today. I believe it is around 112. I hear someone say it is 111. Well, it was not all-embracing to begin with. I was in San Francisco in a humble capacity in 1945. No one could have dreamed that that body would have the membership it has today, and there will be further increases. It is an amazing institution. It is 18 years of age. The league of nations died at 16 years of age. At 18 one goes through a bewildering change. The United Nations is doing the same. There are some problems in connection with it, and the minister has mentioned them, including the need of action to require member nations to make their contributions. The hon. gentleman dealt with that matter at length. I know what he is trying to achieve. It is a preposterous proposition, that because a nation is strong and powerful it can say: I belong to the club but I won't pay the membership fees. That is what it amounts to. It amounts to saying: I want to be a member and I want all the privileges, but I want somebody else to pay. It is all right if you can do that, but it will not, in the United Nations, assure the preservation of that body.

I notice the minister did not deal with a matter he raised outside the House of Commons—an increase in the membership of the security council. That is desirable. It is necessary so that representation may be secured for the many groups of nations in Africa, in Asia and in other parts of the world. That is the ideal. But it cannot be achieved without the consent of the U.S.S.R. and there is every evidence, if the information I have is correct, that it would impose a veto. The question of seats in the United Nations is one which my

hon. friend from Oxford will deal with at length, from the vast experience he has had of that body. I do not intend to say more, except that we in Canada should make clear our view that nations should be required to pay their dues.

The United Nations has brought about the end of many serious difficulties. I do not intend to read out the list I have here, but for those who are interested, the Canadian foundation for education in world law has an article in the current issue of its journal entitled "Peace in Our Time". It shows the number of wars and revolutions in all parts of the world since 1945, and it is an amazing list. Some of us fail to realize, sometimes, that while we have lived in peace, among a vast proportion of the nations on the earth there have been wars throughout this period of time. And there would have been more, but for the United Nations.

I feel that while it might be arguable that when the cold war softens we ought not to bring up matters which could be provocative, we should do more than just enunciate in the House of Commons our belief in non-discrimination and in the right of self-determination. I feel that the present government should continue what this party endeavoured to bring about, namely support of the members of the United Nations for a resolution calling on the U.S.S.R. to give to the subjugated peoples under its control or the control of its satellites the right to determine for themselves their future course. We think in this regard of the subjugation of people in Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary and the Ukraine; we also think of Latvia and other countries of the Baltic. I heard Khrushchev say that he believed in self-determination, that with him this was a basic principle. Because of the overwhelming number of foreign races who are members of the United Nations today, colonialism is not regarded as colonialism if only the right white race is involved.

It is hard to get support from those of the coloured race, the minister will agree, to join in a resolution against the U.S.S.R. for its tyranny over the people of Europe and elsewhere. Last year and the year before we endeavoured to bring about such a resolution, but we did not have the general support we had hoped for. At the NATO conference in Paris in December of 1957 I was able to secure the inclusion of a term in a resolution calling upon the U.S.S.R. to assure the peoples under its control their right to determine their own destiny. I should like to see a strong stand taken in that connection.

There is something more I find rather difficult to understand. The minister dealt in grandiloquent terms with the question of