

and the United States of America. Our recent victories could not have been achieved without that type of cooperation. Had this existed back in the nineteen-thirties very likely this war would never have been fought. If peace is to be maintained after the war this cooperation will have to continue, because no international organization, at least not of the type now visualized, can maintain peace unless the major powers can agree.

I am prepared to support the government's action in respect to the invitation to send representatives to San Francisco. Furthermore I am in general accord with sections 1, 2, 4 and 5 of the resolution. On the other hand, I am not quite certain what the approval of section 3 really implies. For instance, does it imply an endorsement of the final act of the Bretton Woods agreement? I say that for this reason: certain statements have been made recently by President Roosevelt and Mr. Edward Stettinius which would indicate that Bretton Woods is an integral part of the international organization that is to be set up. I should like to quote what these two gentlemen have said. I quote first from the Lethbridge *Herald* of February 13, in which I find this statement attributed to President Roosevelt:

The Bretton Woods plan is the cornerstone for international economic cooperation.

Then in the February issue of the *Reader's Digest* I find an article by Mr. Edward Stettinius. Referring to the monetary stabilization fund, the international bank for reconstruction and various other international organizations that have been set up, he says:

All these organizations clearly are but so many spokes to the international wheel. They need a hub. The Dumbarton Oaks plan authorizes the assembly to act as the hub with the economic and social council as its principal operating mechanism.

It must be quite plain that if any of the spokes of the wheel are unsound, that wheel may collapse and the hub with it. Therefore I say that if the final act of Bretton Woods is a declaration of unsound policy it is bound greatly to endanger the success of any international organization that is set up to try to maintain peace in the world in the future.

I believe the Dumbarton Oaks proposals would form a basis for the discussion of an international peace organization, but there is one thing we must keep in mind at all times: you cannot build a temple of peace upon a foundation of economic war. Unfortunately this government, along with certain other governments, has already sponsored or played a leading part in sponsoring economic war, even before the European war has ceased.

When I say that I have in mind the Bretton Woods agreement. The Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) in his speech reminded us that two or three years ago he stated that a new social order would have to be brought in and be well on its way before the end of the war or we might look for it in vain, and he referred to the fact that certain steps had been taken to that end already—UNRRA, mutual aid and lend-lease. I think we all agree that those were fine measures in the interests of peace, but I sometimes wonder why it is proposed that after the end of the war mutual aid and lend-lease shall be supplanted by the final act of the Bretton Woods agreement. Lend-lease and mutual aid undoubtedly help to maintain peace, just as the final act of the Bretton Woods agreement is bound to cause international friction throughout the world.

I think the Prime Minister is to be congratulated upon the speech that he delivered to both houses of parliament at Westminster on May 11, 1944. I took that speech to mean that he stood against international centralized control and in favour of international co-operation on policies discussed and approved by each country. And I agree that while it is desirable to have close cooperation between members of the British commonwealth of nations, it is equally important to extend that cooperation to other nations of the world that desire peace. The declaration of the principles of the Atlantic charter laid the foundations for such cooperation. To my mind the greatest danger in the way of implementing that declaration is first of all the post-war fight for foreign markets, and secondly the attitude of certain people and certain organizations towards the Soviet Union. You often hear people say that it is no use trying to have cooperation with the Soviet Union because they cannot be trusted. I say that we have no more reason to distrust the Soviet Union than the Soviet Union have to distrust us, on the basis of what happened from 1930 to the outbreak of war.

I believe that world peace will be greatly endangered if the decisions reached at Bretton Woods and embodied in the final act are put into operation, because to my mind that final act means four specific things. First it means a declaration of economic war; second, it means the restoration of a gold standard of an even more vicious character than that of 1925; third, it is bound to be a menace to the good will that exists between the members of the British commonwealth of nations, and lastly it means loss of national sovereignty. I agree with the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggart (Mr. Coldwell) when he said it would