

What are these documents about? In the first place, they contain secret directives for the extermination of Soviet people.

Secondly, apart from the general directives providing for wholesale extermination, these documents include orders and instructions for the slaughter primarily of Soviet leading workers and intellectuals.

The whole essence of Hitlerism in all its hideous nakedness is revealed in this meticulously thought-out programme for the extermination of nations.

The documents in our possession draw a frightful picture of the planned and deliberate extermination of the Soviet peoples. But are these plans any different from those which have been and are still being effected in the west, in southeastern Europe, in the north and wherever else the ominous swastika still flies?

One has but to recall the destruction of Rotterdam and Warsaw, the slaughter in Belgrade, Lidice, all the sanguinary activities of Himmler, Heydrich and other Hitlerite satraps in the occupied countries of Europe. Who can count the number of common graves in Poland or estimate the number of patriots in Norway, Holland, Belgium, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia and France brutally murdered or tortured to death?

Then this conclusion:

The peoples of occupied Europe are anxiously and impatiently awaiting deliverance.

Surely that is an inspiration for the passing of this bill, and a reason for recognizing that future expenditures will probably be on a serious scale. But when we can vote, as we did this year, \$5,000 million for killing and destruction, surely \$90 million for feeding the hungry is not too much. It does seem to me that Canada and the Canadian people, when we pass this bill, will be happier, happier in finding that we have appreciated a real duty. I recall a philosophy of life which was given to us by Robert Morrison, a member of the British delegation of the Empire Parliamentary Association who visited us last summer. In one of his addresses he left with us a thought which it seems to me the House of Commons may take when they conclude the passing of this bill, as I am sure they will. He put it in this way, "I searched for happiness, and happiness eluded me. I turned to service, and happiness found me." That applies, in my view, to nations as it does to individuals.

Mr. HANSELL: I notice in the schedule to the bill, article III, sections 1 and 2, that the council is appointed by each of the member governments. It goes on to state that the council when assembled shall select its own chairman, and there are some provisions respecting the general constitution and the working of the council. But when we turn to section 3 we find that the central committee of the council has been already

selected, and that it consists of what I would term the "big four"—Great Britain, the United States, China and Russia. The central committee is already decided upon. It seems to me that this is putting the cart before the horse, and I should like the parliamentary assistant to enlighten us as to why the appointment or selection of the central committee is not left to the larger council when it meets, at the same time that it appoints its chairman.

I am in favour of the bill. I believe that we have a moral obligation to our fellow man, and that there must be a recognition that no human being should go hungry or cold. That is what I would like to term Christian humanism. Therefore I am favouring the bill, but I am not doing so without making one or two other observations which are not so complimentary to things that are related in a way to the principle of the bill.

I do not know how far I can agree with the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggart as to the length of time it will take to rehabilitate the liberated countries. I understand it is provided that the united nations shall furnish about one-fifth of the cost of rehabilitation. In other words, the devastated countries will have to supply four-fifths of the agricultural products and other materials they require. I should be glad if the parliamentary assistant would throw some light on that, because if that is the case the bill is rightly called a relief bill, for that is all it is. It embodies a principle which we have recognized for a good many years, namely, that we have to give some sort of relief. We have tried relief schemes before. We tried them at home, but I do not think the governments in power in those days did a very good job of relief. While this, I know, is a slightly different matter, there seems to be a little irony about the fact that the very government which could not solve its relief problem internally now joins an international organization to try to solve the problem of the relief of the world.

While I am on that point I wish to mention another matter which has given me a good deal of concern. It gives me concern when we set out to pass a bill like this and such bills as the billion dollar gift to Britain and the united nations mutual aid bill and so forth. Not so long ago we heard of the terrible starvation in India. I mention this because India may be a little closer to us than some of the countries which have been devastated in this war. India is within the British commonwealth of nations, and if ever the rest of the British