

our brief on Austria, in view of the fact that the special deputies in London were not dealing with Germany first and Austria afterwards, but were dealing with Austria and Germany concurrently during their session there?

What actually happened, and I am sorry this was so because to some extent I believe it affected Canada's prestige, was that when the special deputies were clearing out their desks and packing their bags to go home, our submission with respect to Austria arrived for consideration. That was just one day before the special deputies concluded their work in London. I believe the thing can be put in simple terms. Either we are interested in the Austrian settlement or we are not. I believe we are; and if we are, I am dead sure we should have made our submissions concurrently with those we made in respect to Germany. If we were not interested, no submission at all should have gone in. That, I think, is clearly the position in which the government finds itself.

I want to make one further observation in regard to our submission on Austria. In that country two considerations—in the opinion of the foreign minister of Austria, in any event—stand out above everything else. One is the internal reorganization of Austria on a democratic basis. We cannot have a free Austria without the withdrawal of the occupation forces from that country at the very earliest appropriate time. But of equal and perhaps even greater importance is the question of the definition of the German assets in Austria, and what the Russians are entitled to do in the way of taking Austrian resources for their own purposes. That is one of the major difficulties facing Austrian rehabilitation; and until there is a clarification of the terms of the Potsdam agreement with respect to the title to Austrian resources there can be no real reconstruction of Austria's economy or her political structure. I believe our government missed an important point when, in the submission Canada made, that important matter was left out of our brief.

In the moment or so remaining at my disposal I want to say that no single nation has a greater stake in what happens in Moscow than has Canada. Our position, geographically, politically, militarily and every other way makes it impossible for this country ever again to be an optional participant in a world conflict. Making up our minds with respect to that perhaps we should be prepared to go a step farther and say that in another war this country itself might well be the battle area. Just as we rush to fight a fire in our neighbour's house in order to save our own, and at the same time save the town or city,

[Mr. Graydon.]

so must we see that no smouldering embers are left unextinguished which might start anywhere in the world an international blaze that could result in the destruction of humanity. The refusal of Canada in the past to make international affairs our own immediate personal concern has been a disastrous experience for us. Twice in about a quarter of a century we have been led down the pathway of war. A hundred thousand of the very flower of our Canadian manhood lie in alien countries, mute and powerful testimony to what our country was prepared to do in war. Whatever may be the cost of peace, it can never approach the cost of war. Whatever this country has to pay with respect to permanent peace I think must be considered in the light of what I have said.

Between the two great wars there were statesmen in this country—and this is not at all by way of criticism, because I suppose they reflected public opinion at the time—one of whom said that as far as war was concerned Canada was a fireproof house, and the other that nothing then happening in Abyssinia was worth the life of a single Canadian soldier. Add to that the spectacle one saw in the House of Commons the year before the war, when an hon. member asked the house to adopt a resolution of neutrality in case of armed conflict. These were all straws showing the way the wind blew.

So I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that we must do something to see to it that the world's casualty lists shall never again be published, that the savage dogs of war never again shall be unleashed. At international conferences I have listened to men who were skilful in employing their own language to make it meet various situations arising from time to time, but it remained for a little boy thirteen years of age, who I am told came up to London to be present at the first general assembly of the united nations which a number of us attended, to put into words the thought so many of us have in mind as to the objectives of the united nations. While I cannot vouch for the authenticity of every word, I am told that this is what happened. The little lad came to London under his own steam and stood for a long time one dark, cold, foggy morning, and on into the afternoon, waiting to get into the visitors' gallery at that assembly. As he was going up the stairs someone asked him, "Why are you here?" The little lad stopped and said, "I don't quite know why I am here, but I am going to tell my story and perhaps then you will know." This is the story he told. "I am only thirteen," he said, "but I lost my mother two