

*United Nations Agreement*

abrogate the powers of this parliament and of the parliaments or other representative institutions of the other participating countries?

Then I refer to article V, section 1, which provides for contributions. It says, "Each member government will contribute to the support of the administration", and then follow a few words which are inapplicable. "The amount and character of the contributions... will be determined from time to time by its appropriate constitutional bodies." What does that mean? Does that mean that each of these forty-four signatory countries will determine for itself the amount of its contribution, that there will be no control as to the contribution which shall be made by nations, whether in accordance with population, resources or other considerations? That section by itself may have within it the germ of uncertainty and might, unless classified, very well cause dissatisfaction among the participating nations, in that it leaves to each nation the right of determining for itself the amount of its contribution. One can well picture the situation when the war is over and the influence of a common dedication to common ideals is ended; then difficulties and jealousies may arise, when one nation makes as its contribution an amount less than that of another nation with equal or almost equal resources and population.

As to the general principle of this bill, while it grants very large powers to the governor in council, discussion with regard to that phase may well be left until the bill is in committee. Personally I believe that altogether too wide powers are being granted under this bill, and that the exercise of authority should, as soon as the war is over, rest with parliament, not with the governor in council. I can appreciate the fact that during the war, when immediate action is necessary, the governor in council might well have to exercise the powers it has, whether under the War Measures Act or otherwise; but why should those powers be continued after the end of the war is something I find it difficult to understand. I realize that in taking this view one does not earn the popularity of the government. But to-day in this country there is an ever-increasing practice of surrendering on the part of parliament to administrative boards, to the governor in council, to bodies independent of parliament, rights which should be exercised by parliament, and although that tendency may be justifiable in time of war, it certainly cannot be justified in time of peace. As far as this bill is concerned, if I have the opportunity I shall move an amendment providing that the authority of the governor in council shall be applicable only during the period of

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

the war and not beyond the termination of hostilities. In referring to the end of the war I do not mean the signing of the peace treaty, for to-day we all believe that the signing of a peace treaty may be removed four, five or even ten years beyond the end of hostilities, and by the end of the war I mean the actual conclusion of hostilities so far as Canada and the British commonwealth are concerned.

In saying what I have, I do not want it to be understood that I do not support the principle of the bill. Heartily I give my support to the first step which this parliament has made to the realization of the ideal of all the centuries, the achievement of peace, by each nation assuming as its responsibility the welfare of all other nations. It was stated in a recent issue of the magazine *Foreign Affairs* that this agreement represents the beginning of the international set-up which we shall see in the world after the war, whereby the nations comprising the council under UNRRA may establish in their various spheres of influence their own national police force, collaborating together instead of having an international police force, whereby the peace of the world will be assured.

This bill is one which, if properly administered, will do much toward affording a laboratory wherein the nations of the world will be able to work out a post-war plan for international security and economic welfare. For Canada to have the privilege of participation is a great honour. For Canada there are economic possibilities as well, if the government is prepared, in the administration of this legislation, to assure that our contribution shall be, in the main, one of agricultural production, whereby Canadian farmers, when the war is over, may have a share in the greater international trade which we believe will be established when the principles of the Atlantic charter are implemented.

Mr. PAUL MARTIN (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, in speaking for a few moments on this matter, I feel I should start where the hon. gentleman who has just spoken concluded. He began his speech by saying that the conference which provoked this bill was perhaps the most momentous conference since the war began, in terms of setting up some measure of permanency in the international organization of the world; and he concluded his speech by saying that if the opportunity was afforded him he would move an amendment to make the provisions of the bill applicable only for the duration of the war.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: No, Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted—only in so far as the powers conferred on the governor in council to act independently of parliament.