

not been much change since then. Everybody's attention was riveted on fuel and food. There was destruction which it is impossible to describe—great twisted bridges over the Elbe, the Weser and other rivers; the great city of Hanover with seven out of every ten buildings levelled flat as the prairie, only two out of ten capable of being repaired, and one out of ten that had not been touched at all. We saw the buildings in Berlin looking almost like a material corpse which somehow had not lain down. Yes, it was a depressing sight to see the Reichstag, the great parliament buildings of Germany, in such a state.

Mr. MITCHELL: Is that not the price one pays for making a fool of himself?

Mr. GRAYDON: I agree with my hon. friend for once.

Mr. MITCHELL: What about Rotterdam?

Mr. GRAYDON: One saw the great Reichstag, in ruins and two Russian soldiers conducting a black market in all kinds of materials with some ten or fifteen German women at the door of that great chamber. One could not help realizing that if Hitler could look up from where he is now he would see that things have changed; that the days when he used to thunder his challenges across the world have gone forever and that of him it could be said, in the words of Gray's *Elegy* Written in a Country Churchyard, "The paths of glory lead but to the grave".

I apologize to the house for mentioning these personal impressions, but one thing which struck me particularly, and which I am sure I shall never forget, was the comment, after we had come through all this indescribable devastation, of a little English corporal whose house had been blitzed out in 1940 and again in 1941. Somebody in the party said, "What a distressing sight this is in Berlin!" The little corporal said, in his best English, which I could not possibly imitate, "These blighters asked for it, and they bloody well got it, didn't they?" It was, I think, an indication of the feeling of revenge which was then in the hearts of people who had suffered so greatly at the hands of those who are now suffering the pangs of defeat. If one can go by the feeling and the sense of the people who know something of the German problem over there—and I am not speaking of the Germans themselves—one of the things which stood out in what we learned from the people we had contact with from time to time was the fact that if you are going to make a new Germany, if you are going to make a nation which will not be a menace to the peoples of the world in the days which lie ahead, you

must do something more than is proposed in the Canadian submissions; you must educate the children of Germany into a new mode of life and a new conception of what democracy and peace really mean.

I think that one of the greatest omissions in the submissions of Canada is the lack of mention of the educational aspect of the treatment of the German people. In the Potsdam declaration we find these words, put in not by Germans or Canadians, but by the representatives of the big four themselves. This—reading directly from the Potsdam declaration—is their avowed objective:

It is not the intention of the allies to destroy or enslave the German people, but that they shall be given the opportunity to prepare for the eventual reconstruction of their life on a democratic and peaceful basis. If their efforts are steadily directed to this end, it will be possible for them in due course to take their place among the free and peaceful peoples of the world.

This leads me, Mr. Speaker, to suggest the most conspicuous omission in the Canadian submissions. In any settlement education along democratic lines must be included; because as I see it—and as those who know much better than I do seem to see it—it is the key to permanent peace. That is the view of those who are closest to the picture and who know.

I just wish to make one further observation with respect to the German peace submissions. I think this nation was again too late in presenting her submissions on Germany. It seems to me also that if our German submissions have merit—and I believe they have—particularly with respect to the international statute, they should have been presented before the big four had made their elaborate preparations for a peace treaty discussion in Moscow. The whole question had, in my opinion, jelled at that time; and by the time our submissions came to the special deputies on January 30 of this year, Canada was too late to have them properly considered. That, I think, indicates part of our position with respect to the German submissions themselves.

I now wish to come to our submissions with respect to the Austrian peace settlement. I do not want to be offensive with respect to this, and I hope the government will not feel that I am, but I am really speaking with some restraint when I say that the Austrian submissions, as I see them, are not much more than a nice harmless little essay on international affairs. As a positive, active, vigorous and constructive brief it is not in the same class at all with our German submissions. May I, through you, Mr. Speaker, put this question to the government: Why did twenty-six days elapse between the time we put in our submissions on Germany and the time we put in