

in order to make it impossible for the debtor nation to ship its goods in. The result, of course, is international friction and repudiation. I think most people will agree that to a very large extent this policy was responsible for the war of 1914, and to a certain extent for the war we are fighting today. If we are not going to use long term loans; if we are not going to use the international monetary proposals to provide this help, and I insist we should not, then I think the only sound and logical way to provide it is either under lend-lease or mutual aid. I believe the mutual aid bill should become a definite part of UNRRA, so that help may be given to bring about the rehabilitation and reconstruction of the devastated industries.

In the past this group has always given full support to the principle of mutual aid, and similar measures. We have given that support entirely on moral grounds. We have taken the stand that we are in this war with the other united nations and that it is our moral obligation to pool our resources in order to unite them against the enemy. We feel also that these policies should be continued after the war to extend help to those nations which have suffered as a result of enemy action. If such assistance is not given; if we allow those nations to remain on a standard of bare subsistence, in a state of relief, then I do not think it can be said that we are laying sound foundations for a world peace. Certainly it will not be a peace based on Christian principles. Therefore I should like the minister to explain just to what extent the resolutions passed at Atlantic City have made UNRRA a relief proposal.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggarr): Mr. Speaker, I find myself to a very large extent in agreement with the hon. member for Acadia (Mr. Quelch), who has just taken his seat. I do not follow him in all his arguments, but I think we should go very carefully into the principle of this measure both now and when it is in committee. We are quite prepared to give not only full but enthusiastic support to the united nations relief organization in so far as it will assist in the rehabilitation of the nations now under the heel of Hitler or suffering from the extremities of war, and in placing the world on a saner, sounder footing than we have known in the past. Before we finally adopt a measure of this description, however, which is so wide in its implications, I believe we should have full discussion and a clear understanding of it. Since the war began it has become somewhat customary in this house to take for granted that Great Britain, the United States, and latterly Russia, the great powers, would

more or less decide most matters; then we would get the decision and to all intents and purposes fall in line with what had been decided. I think that policy is wrong. We should give the great powers all the cooperation we can, but we should not forget that there may be circumstances in which the interests of the smaller nations may not be altogether the same as those of one or more or all of the great powers.

The principle of this bill, as I see it, and it so states, is to enable the government of Canada to give effect to an agreement for the establishment of a united nations relief and rehabilitation administration; and the method proposed in this bill is to empower the governor in council to do whatever may be proper and expedient in order to give effect to that agreement. Although when the bill was brought down the house was more or less under the impression that it was mainly for the purpose of authorizing an interim payment of \$10,000,000, the adoption of this measure will in effect give the government very wide powers in regard to the agreement and the policies to be carried out thereunder. I followed with some interest the remarks of the hon. member for Acadia, and I want to emphasize what he said in regard to the purpose of the bill. As I see it, when this relief and rehabilitation organization was first set up most people thought it would be not merely a temporary relief organization but quite largely a reconstruction body. As the hon. member for Acadia has already pointed out, however, and as has been pointed out in certain newspapers, we seem to have departed from what many hoped to be the basic idea behind this organization. For example, President Roosevelt sent a message to congress last November, I think on November 15, in which he said that the agreements provided only a framework for giving first aid to the liberated areas. This work would be only a beginning of the tremendous job of aiding the war victims; the liberated peoples themselves would have to assume the greater part of this task. Other machinery and measures would be necessary to solve the long-range problems of reconstruction, but UNRRA could only lay a foundation for reconstruction. The latter part of what I have just said was the interpretation placed upon the remarks of President Roosevelt at that time in an editorial appearing in the *London Times* of November 16, 1943. The purpose of UNRRA, as I understand it, is definitely limited; I quote the words:

. . . provide assistance in the resumption of urgently needed agricultural and industrial production, and the restoration of essential services.