

Hon. Mrs. FALLIS: If there is any one thing on which we Canadians are in agreement, I believe it is this, that no other nation in the world more sincerely desires to avoid another war. Then, it seems to me, it is only simple and intelligent reasoning to assume that the more anxious we are to avoid another war, the more wholeheartedly we will support any decision taken at the conference, any machinery which may be set up, any instrument which may be fashioned, which will be effective as a means of preventing wars in the future.

We have heard it stated several times to-day, and we all know it is true, that the prime condition upon which world peace and security will be founded is the continued solidarity of the Big Three. Without that foundation we know there will be no peace and security for the world in the days to come. But, I submit, it is also necessary now to bring as quickly as we can a measure of hope and present security to the liberated areas of devastated Europe. That cannot be done unless the people are first fed and clothed and housed. I realize, honourable senators, that since this does not come within the scope of the motion before us I may be slightly out of order, but I would ask the indulgence of the House because it is something that is very much upon my mind at the present time. We read in the papers statements like that made the other day by the Archbishop of Canterbury about conditions in Northern Holland, that all the horrors of war through which the people of that country had passed were as nothing compared to the horrors of slow death from starvation which they are going through at the present time. I felt on reading that and similar statements that if they make the impact upon us that they should, if we have not already become hardened by war's brutality and suffering, it is a time for the searching of our national conscience to ascertain whether we are doing everything within our power to help the peoples in those war-ravaged countries.

I know that this matter is under consideration by the Government. We all know that the extent to which we can help by sending supplies is governed largely by the shipping space available; but from day to day there have been rather disquieting items in the press saying that the Government hesitates to impose food rationing because it might be unpopular, or words to that effect. That is not official, but just common report.

Of course, we all know that in every community there are some selfish people who object to self-denial, but I think I speak for the great majority of Canadian women when I say that if the matter were properly explained

they would be not only willing but glad to have the strictest kind of food rationing imposed in this country, if thereby we could send more help than we are now sending to the people of those devastated areas. Honestly, when I read in the papers of individuals in England setting apart a portion of their scanty daily rations and sending it in parcels to the people of Holland and other countries where starvation is rife, I am almost ashamed to look at the tables to which we sit down in Canada. On behalf of the women, whom I represent in this House, I should like to repeat that I am sure they would be only too glad to have the strictest kind of food rationing imposed upon them if that would help to alleviate the sufferings of people in lands that have been overrun by the enemy.

I come back to the resolution before us. Honourable senators will recall that after the Prime Minister made his speech in moving the resolution in another place there was a good deal of comment on his failure to make more than a slight passing reference to Canada's relations to the other members of the Commonwealth. The honourable leader of the Government in this House (Hon. Mr. King) has replied to that comment to-day and quoted very reassuring statements, which we accept unreservedly. At the same time we have only to cast our thoughts back over the debates of the last week or so in another place to realize that if one ventures to suggest the sincere opinion that Canada can best fulfil her destiny by working in closest co-operation with Great Britain and the other members of the Commonwealth, one runs a decided risk of being lectured for having Tory Imperialistic tendencies or accused of wishing to see Canada return to her "colonial status". I believe that was a strong point in one speech made in another place.

I always think that people who talk of Canada going back to her "colonial status" must be suffering from an inferiority complex, because they base their argument upon conditions which no longer exist, except in the realm of their own imagination. Surely any discussion which takes place on this matter to-day should be founded upon facts and conditions of to-day rather than upon those of two or three decades ago. I was much interested the other day to see how one writer expressed his opinion on this. He said:

Just as the War of Independence between Great Britain and the United States left its mark upon the United States to such a degree that many people there still do their thinking in the mental surroundings of nearly two centuries ago, so here in Canada much of the discussion and argument is in attempting to provide against the dangers which disappeared years ago.