

about the hundreds of millions of dollars that have been paid by the taxpayers to hold ceiling prices?

Hon. Mr. ROBERTSON: I think that is a fair criticism. The question is whether or not the cost of the basic necessities of life should be spread over the whole country or be borne by unfortunate individuals who were not in as favourable a position as other people. A whole mass of people in this country, the so-called white-collar class, have gone through some very trying times, and I think the government is entitled to credit for having realized that the only practical course was to subsidize the production of certain basic necessities of life, so as to spread the cost over the whole community. I believe that policy commended itself to the right thinking people of this country.

I know that business is heavily taxed; but as I said to a friend of mine the other day when he was groaning about taxation, "I can remember in my business experience when what we were worrying about was not our income tax, but the fact that we did not have any income to be taxed." Any member of this house who was in business from 1929 to 1933 knows what I am talking about.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. ROBERTSON: I submit, honourable senators, that in this country business has emerged well from the war. I venture to say that throughout the length and breadth of this land there is hardly a business which is not in better financial position today than it was in 1939, in respect of its obligations, its cash into the treasury, and everything else. True, business has been taxed heavily, but it has had a large income to be taxed. And because of the controls that we have had in operation, business faces the future far more confidently than if prices had been allowed to soar. All honourable members who are in business know this just as well as I do.

It is true that somebody else might have acted differently during the war. Canada handled its affairs in this war better than in the previous war. This was not because of the leadership of one particular party; the contribution was made by all the people of Canada. If there should be another war—which God forbid—we should improve on what we did during this last one.

Despite the criticisms of my honourable friend, I say that Canada is in a pretty good position today and faces the future with a great deal of confidence.

I want to pass on now and refer briefly to the United Nations meeting at New York. I do not intend to go into any great detail, but

rather to give you one or two impressions that I brought back with me. That meeting was charged with two great responsibilities in its search for future peace. One is the question of disarmament and a world police force, and the other is the removing of the causes of war. These were tackled with, I think, a fair degree of success. I want to say, honourable senators, that you have reason to be proud of the part played by the leader of the opposition. He was the chairman of a committee, and I assure you that he was keenly interested in it and rendered a great service not only by his advice in regard to the various matters that he took up, but through the friendly way that he had in meeting the various delegates. After all, that is a very important factor and exercises a very great influence.

As regards the problem of disarmament, as you remember, a long debate resulted in a unanimous resolution that the Security Council should undertake a plan of disarmament and a world police force, coupled with the principle of international inspection. Now that is a great step forward. Even if it takes months, even though it takes a year or more to work out the details of it, I say it is a tremendous step forward. Then, in the field of removing the causes of war, I will only remind you that both in the political field and in the social and economic field there were some very ticklish questions. There was the matter of Franco in Spain, and of the complaint brought by India against South Africa, which, as the leader of the opposition said, raised the whole question of colour. Then there was the problem of post-UNRRA relief, of food, of matters which deal directly or indirectly with the causes of war. I believe that when the report comes down the leader of the opposition and myself, your delegates there, should deal with this at greater length and invite from honourable senators a more detailed discussion, because neither he nor I have had the opportunity to place it before you.

I want to refer to some of my impressions. In one of the committees, which had to do with the subject of post-UNRRA relief, there was a very long and bitter debate. UNRRA, which was largely financed by the United States, Great Britain and Canada, and provided assistance to starving countries, was coming to an end. The question was what would happen after it ceased at the end of the past year. There was a very definite difference of opinion. The United States and Great Britain took the definite position that while they were going to contribute and would contribute whatever assistance was necessary, they did not want to have it distributed on what might be called an international basis by an