

Moscow meeting may be over before the views of the Canadian people as expressed by parliament are known to them and to the world.

The debate on the address, which resumes today, will afford a wholly inadequate opportunity for parliament as a whole to make its voice heard on these matters and these alone. This further contributes to the urgency surrounding this motion now.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the house that the hon. member shall have leave so to move?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman may proceed.

Mr. GRAYDON: Mr. Speaker, in moving the adjournment of the house I do not approach this subject lightly or without due regard to the serious international situation not only as it affects this parliament and the government and every party in parliament but as it affects so substantially the very lives and homes and firesides of the people of Canada.

The house and the country I think will welcome this opportunity, the first that we have had since the San Francisco charter was debated in 1945, to have a full-dress debate on external affairs. It seemed to me, and this is my object in raising the question at this time, that here is the place to thresh out our difficulties and mobilize public opinion, the place to find common ground upon which we may work so that we may march with a united front and if at all possible speak with one voice in the councils of the world.

In 1946 Canada was represented at no fewer than ninety-eight international gatherings, including the all-important peace conference at Paris, while parliament spent in the meantime fewer than two days out of 119 in discussing foreign relations. That is not good enough. Parliament must keep abreast of the movements and developments in international affairs the same as it tries to do with domestic affairs.

It is true that the standing committee on external affairs met some twenty times last year and did an excellent job under the capable chairmanship of the hon. member for Cochrane (Mr. Bradette); but there was little if any discussion of general policy. The estimates of the department were brought before the committee and considered, but only a fraction of the membership of the house had an opportunity to participate in the discussions. The committee did however bring in a report, later

[Mr. Graydon.]

unanimously concurred in by the house, in which they recommended that time should be set aside each week for the discussion of international matters. I am of the opinion that it should not be necessary to bring in a motion such as the one I had to make at this particular time in order to discuss external affairs. We should have the opportunity of dealing with external problems in a regular and orderly way. From now on parliament should make up its mind to give more time to discussion of foreign affairs.

First of all I wish to deal with the question of our participation in the peace settlement. *Maclean's* magazine of March 1, 1947 put in a nutshell the argument between Canada and the special deputies of the big four who have been meeting in London. I wish to read a few words from an article headed "Peace Isn't Private Property", because I think it will expedite the proceedings and give to the ordinary citizen of Canada a fair picture of what happened in the meeting of the deputies. The article reads as follows:

Canada's argument with the big four deputies charged with drafting the German peace treaty was no mere matter of wounded vanity. Here's what happened:

Deputies met in London to prepare drafts for the real big four meeting in Moscow. They invited seventeen smaller combatants to send in written statements, with oral comment if desired, on the treaties with Germany and Austria.

Canada didn't think this good enough and suggested that smaller powers be given a share in the early committee work.

That suggestion was ignored. Our high commissioner, Norman Robertson, was then instructed to ask the deputies a question:

"If Canada does appear before you, how can you assure us that this will not be our last chance to say anything about the German treaty?"

Still no reply. It became evident that at least one of the big four would prefer to answer "no." The German treaty was a matter for great powers who had "paid in blood;" small fry should be neither seen nor heard.

It was not for this that Canada put three-quarters of a million men in arms, fought on every western European front, gave \$3.5 billions in materials to allies, including Russia, who needed more than they could pay for.

It was not for this, either, that Greece starved and Poland suffered, that Yugoslavia pinned fifteen German divisions. Not to be told at the end of it: "Run along now, we shan't need you again until next time. If you have any ideas about the peace, write a letter to our secretaries."

We fought for peace as an overriding national interest. We did not fight to maintain a balance of power, to serve any imperial interest anywhere in the world. We fought for our lives, which the international policies of great powers had put in jeopardy.

Now that the fighting is done, we must have a real voice in the shaping of that peace for which