

ment needed a separate minister, it is the Department of External Affairs. I would point out that not only is there no separate Minister of External Affairs, but there is no parliamentary assistant for this great department which has developed so fast in recent years. It is not enough for this country to have a Department of External Affairs which is a lean-to to the Prime Minister's house so far as parliamentary institutions are concerned. I hold the personal opinion very strongly that we in Canada are entering an era of diplomatic and international affairs of a serious nature, one which is fraught, I think, with possibilities of a kind which I need not enlarge upon to-night. I want to emphasize to this house the importance of having the government so organized that this department shall be something more than it is to-day. This nation deserves that, and in the days that lie ahead I believe the government will find that that is so.

There is one other criticism I wish to make of the government, a matter which I raised a few weeks ago in this house. I do not think the government of Canada pressed sufficiently hard to have the international peace centre of the world come to the Dominion of Canada. In my opinion there were most compelling reasons why this nation might properly have looked forward to being the great international peace centre of the future. In my view the circumstances warranted the exerting of pressure which was at least equal to that exerted by other nations. I have no desire to reflect upon the choice that has been made, but I do want to reflect upon the wisdom and judgment of the government which was remiss and in default with respect to our Canadian people in that regard.

I do not desire to-night to enter into a detailed discussion of the charter itself. There will be others in our party perhaps who will, as the debate proceeds, deal with the various sections of the charter. I was interested in the minister's report of the various aspects of the charter. He spoke about the question of withdrawal. As he properly pointed out, there is nothing in the charter which actually says that a nation may withdraw from its obligations or rights so far as the charter is concerned. However, when this matter came up in the senate of the United States the legal opinion was given, as most hon. members know, that according to the report of the conference itself, while it was not specifically mentioned in the charter, nevertheless the right of withdrawal was left to any nation which desired to exercise it.

The minister has made reference to the general assembly and the security council. There are, naturally, weaknesses in any charter

of this kind, but in the setting up of the assembly and the security council, which are quite different in their outlook and jurisdiction from anything connected with the old League of Nations, the attempt was made by Dumbarton Oaks and by San Francisco to retrieve some of the mistakes that had been made in setting up the previous world organization by adopting an organization more suited to the circumstances which now face the world. So that we have in the general assembly and the security council two bodies with a peculiar relationship toward each other. Both of them stem from the charter rather than one from the other.

Let those who may think that the security council is something in the nature of an executive body of the general assembly disabuse their minds of that idea at once. The general assembly has powers to discuss and recommend and to initiate studies. It has no powers actually to enforce permanent peace and security throughout the world. The security council itself is the one organ of the united nations which may be referred to as having the steel knuckles required to take care of those recalcitrant people in the world of to-morrow who may attempt to start aggression.

As the minister pointed out a few moments ago, the security council, with its veto provisions, aroused great controversy at the conference. There was the question of the smaller nations which desired, of course, to increase the power and authority of the general assembly. After all the lengthy discussion of the veto provisions, that power was watered down in only one very minor respect. The veto that was agreed to at Yalta carried through at the San Francisco conference with but one minor change, and that was that there shall be no veto when the matter being decided in the security council is whether or not a certain question should be discussed. In every other respect the veto power remains, so that any one of the five great powers may by refusing to vote unanimously with the others block any enforcement procedure which the security council might otherwise adopt.

There was another Canadian amendment which I do not think the minister mentioned. It arose out of a set of circumstances which I think the house will recognize at once are important. This nation is not one of the five great powers. It could not be one of the five great powers because of our population and general strength. But, this nation more closely approaches a big power than most of the other nations of the world outside the big five powers. It was the feeling of the Canadian delegation, having that in mind, that