

essential to the occupying powers, who are deprived of absolutely necessary man-power because of the military occupation. It seems to me that more important than the presence of large bodies of foreign troops in Germany is the organization of carefully selected civilians from allied countries capable of assisting in the planning of the German economy and of the educational and social rehabilitation of the German people.

But above all it is important that civilian inspection and control by thoroughly competent persons and scientists should be established to ensure that no part of German science and industry will lend itself to the rebuilding of a new war-potential. Such occupation forces—the kind which I visualize—would achieve the objects of security, would assist European recovery, and would be preferable to a purely military occupation. May I repeat that the occupying nations, particularly Great Britain and France because of shortages of man-power, cannot afford to keep large armies in Germany if it can possibly be avoided.

My time does not permit to me to discuss the Austrian treaty. I agree with the hon. member for Peel that we might have had more to say about it, and perhaps said it sooner, but after all our primary interest is indeed in the German settlement; for it was in the war against the German Reich that we were ourselves most involved. We support the idea of an independent Austria whose boundaries should be established on the basis of the country as it was before the *anschluss* of 1938.

I have tried to emphasize the points which seem to need greater emphasis in Canada's representations at the peace conference. We believe that this continent, indeed this whole western hemisphere, including Canada, must be prepared to play a major role in the reconstruction of Europe as a whole. It is in this context that the German and Austrian treaties must be viewed. To my mind the abandonment of the policies underlying UNRRA may be a calamity. This is not our fault; for the Canadian delegation pressed strenuously at the recent assembly of the united nations for at least its replacement by an organization to handle relief which would be international in form and scope. We should continue to press this view. Worse still perhaps has been the failure so far to implement Sir John Boyd Orr's proposal for the establishment of a world food council. As the world's greatest exporter of wheat, we have an entirely proper if selfish interest in world food control to ensure proper returns to producers in times of surplus production as well as reasonable prices to consumers in hardly less frequent periods of

scarcity, and in the feeding of mankind as a whole. But so far, in spite of great hopes, the failure of the nations to organize effective international agencies for the exchange of goods, and the provision of capital equipment to the devastated areas, is not only disappointing but harmful to human welfare.

In short, Canada must not be satisfied merely to express its views on current issues and controversies. I repeat, we can, because of the unique position among the lesser powers which we achieved during the war, take a lead, by declaring again our readiness to play in full our part in assisting the starving displaced millions in Europe to rebuild their own lives and the economy in which their lots may be cast. What all this means, of course, is that we must recognize that peace and prosperity, like modern war and universal suffering, are indivisible.

As section 32 of Canada's submission to the deputies meeting has so well said:

In the long run, to settle the German problem and other world problems, we must build the united nations into an effective instrument for the preservation of peace. This cannot be accomplished without some surrender of national sovereignty and the institution ultimately of some form of world government.

With this conclusion we whole-heartedly agree.

Mr. SOLON E. LOW (Peace River): I do not intend to take very long, Mr. Speaker, to contribute in my small way to this debate. I do not intend, either, to multiply words on matters which have already been discussed quite effectively, I believe, by the two preceding speakers. With most of what both speakers said I could agree. More particularly I feel that the submission made by the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Graydon) was well made. I appreciate, sir, this opportunity for the House of Commons to discuss the matter of external relations and the part that Canada should play in the formulation of treaties of peace for Germany and Austria.

I believe that parliament should have an opportunity at frequent intervals—just how frequent I am not at this moment prepared to say—to discuss external affairs, and on such occasions the members should be given by the government as much information as can possibly be given on the various world problems and developments, particularly as they might affect Canada and her place in the world, or be affected by Canada or Canadian influence. At any rate, members of parliament ought to know what Canada's foreign policy is. We should know the details