

But I doubt if any international organization in the world has the record of achievement that this body has.

When one remembers that in 1919 there were but ten million workers in the world who in some way or another came under the benefits of social security legislation; when one realizes that to-day over three hundred million people in the world have the advantage of social security legislation in one form or another, on the models laid down and suggested by the international labour office, one recognizes the tremendous achievement of the organization. I say with knowledge, because I did associate with the workers of the world recently in London and I know what their convictions are in this matter, that they will look very suspiciously, they will look very carefully at any attempt to delimit the scope and the status of the international labour organization. They will be greatly concerned over any attempt to curb its power or interfere with its tripartite basis.

Consequently, I am happy to be able to say to-day that, on the instructions of this government, I joined with the Minister of Labour in Britain, the Right Hon. Ernest Bevin, in saying before that body that this government was determined to give the international labour office, in relation to the organization contemplated at Dumbarton Oaks, the highest place possible. I suggest—I do not do so dogmatically but respectfully—that when the delegation comes to consider this matter it should consider carefully the wisdom of having the international labour office's future predicated upon a relationship to a body on which the workers and employers of the world are not represented. The proposal as outlined to-day is that by agreement the future relationship of the international labour office and the world security organization should be determined with the social and economic council. That is a body wholly made up of governments on which the workers of the world will have no representative at all, and I should think that this would be a serious violation of the tripartite principle of the international labour office. The international labour office should be given access, not to the social and economic council, but to the assembly of the world security organization. For ultimately, of course, the international labour office must be subservient to the world security organization; but let it be subservient to a body that represents the ultimate power of governments and not to

[Mr. Martin.]

a body that has merely delegated power and one on which the workers and employers have no representative.

My final suggestion about the international labour office is this. At Philadelphia, governments, workers and employers agreed that there should be appointed a negotiating delegation to meet with the governments at Dumbarton Oaks, and as that did not materialize, the governments at San Francisco should determine by agreement with the negotiating delegation the future character of the international labour organization and its relation to the general world organization. I am happier than I can say, in the light of the London discussions, that the government, which I represented, instructed me to take the position that the international labour organization, with its great achievements, its great record, with its representation of workers and employers as well as of governments, should be allowed to continue in the great achievements which throughout its history since the end of the last war it has effected.

As I said at the outset, at first I did, in the light of convictions which I carried for a long time, in common with many other members of this house, including the head of the government, take a doubtful view about the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. Here, at first I was inclined to think, is a makeshift arrangement, a resort to a concert of power arrangement by which throughout history wars have been encouraged if not provoked. But one has to recognize the realities of the moment, and there is no chance of preserving peace if the United States, Great Britain and the Soviet Union cannot act in unison in the days of peace as they have done in the days of war. That is clear, and in answer to Mr. Welles, the former Under-Secretary of State in the United States, I do not think that we are betraying the principles underlying the covenant. I do not think that we are betraying the Wilsonian principles of the rule of law and the settlement of disputes by pacific means through the agency of law and conference. What we have done is to say, "Here is the best we can do at the moment." And, as the President of the United States said, by experiment, given time, we shall improve the organization until ultimately perhaps, if for no other reason than the very nature of our contracting world, the kind of ideal organization many of us want will come about.

I conclude where I began. I cannot say what a tremendous impression it left upon me to come face to face for the first time in an easy way with men from this country and from