

Mr. GRAYDON: He wanted to get rid of red tape and bureaucracy; that is all.

Mr. MARTIN: Even allowing for the refinement that the hon. gentleman has made, in view of the importance which he attached to the measure he will see how wholly negative the application of the bill would be if it were to be restricted simply to the duration of the war.

Mr. GRAYDON: He did not say that.

Mr. MARTIN: He did commend the bill as a step in the right direction. He took the same view as that taken by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggart (Mr. Coldwell), who said that Canadians above all should be the first to give support to this kind of measure. He added that Canada was heavily endowed with the resources of nature and that our standard of living was sufficient to place us in the first line of those who should give support to this bill. I would say to the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggart, if he were in his place at the moment, that I trust he will repeat that remark instead of making many of the statements he has made throughout the country, sometimes in depreciation of this country's position in terms of its standard of living and in terms of what it affords in the way of opportunity to the masses of our people. I agree with him, of course, that Canada should lead as one of the great supplying nations of the world in regard to a measure of this sort.

It seems to me that the significant thing about the organization set up at UNRRA, to which this bill is related, is that it represents the collective effort of the united nations. At the conclusion of the last war the same kind of relief was provided through what might be called a one-man organization, the organization headed by Mr. Hoover. That was an effective organization, but it was subject to all the dangers of that kind of organization, and particularly subject to undue political influences, which this time, because this represents a collective effort, will not, I trust, apply.

The criticism levelled by the hon. member for Acadia (Mr. Quelch) and by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggart in particular, in their two carefully considered statements, was that the bill, and that UNRRA itself, did not go far enough. It was intended merely to apply now to relief and not, as formerly understood, to relief and rehabilitation. What should be remembered is that the bill, as did the conference, deals with a situation which has to be faced at the moment, and while long-term programmes are desirable, the important thing is to deal with situations as they arise. Every hon. member

knows the need for food and clothing, the need for health and medical supplies in Europe, and this is something which requires emergency action, and not action based upon the long term, although that, too, will be needed.

But just as the Hoover programme, just as the efforts of Doctor Nansen and others, prior to the setting up of the League of Nations, were gradually integrated so as to become a part of the League of Nations and of collective organizations generally, so it may be presumed, I think, that this work now begun in the emergency stage will become part of the permanent international organization contemplated in the speeches we have had by the leaders of the three great powers and by our own Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King).

The hon. member for Lake Centre, when appraising the event, might have gone a step farther and praised the contribution made by Canada at UNRRA. He was not wholly correct in saying that UNRRA was the first of the patterns for the future organization of the world. He was perhaps correct in giving it a high place. Perhaps we should give the first place, though possibly not in terms of ultimate balance, to the food conference held at Hot Springs, which certainly did assist in setting the pattern. But UNRRA was, as has been said, a significant conference. It was, during the war, an attempt to set up what every thinking man and woman in this country and throughout the world must hope will ultimately be established among the nations, and Canada played a very special part at UNRRA.

I do not believe that this debate should conclude without some reference to the contribution made by Canada. The house will remember that some time ago, in the enunciation of the government's foreign policy, the Prime Minister laid down the principle which has come to be recognized and used as the principle of functionalism in international affairs. That principle was recognized at UNRRA and had much to do with the successful operation of the conference, and it is only significant, it is only fair, I think, to say that the Prime Minister's parliamentary assistant (Mr. Claxton) played a notable part at that conference, as indeed did Mr. Pearson, now our minister-counsellor at Washington, who has come to be recognized as one of the important men at conferences wherever members of the united nations now meet. So that I agree with the hon. member for Prince Albert—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MARTIN: —the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker) rather, the