

read from *Hansard* make a strong protest before I went across the Atlantic at Canada being invited to come for purposes of consultation on matters related to the settlement of the peace, and not invited to come as a principal, to sit as such with others. One reason why I felt it important to go to England was to discuss that very phase of the situation with the prime minister and the minister of foreign affairs there. I thought that matters of the kind could be referred to much better in conversation than to be made an occasion for discussion across the Atlantic. I would say that I believe that the members of the British government have had and have every desire to see that Canada secures her full representation in important international negotiations, but to some extent the matter has been beyond their control.

My hon. friend has referred to the meeting of foreign ministers that took place in London. If I remember correctly, that meeting was the outgrowth of the conference held at Potsdam. Similarly, there is a conference taking place at Moscow to-day at which are present only the foreign ministers of the United Kingdom, the United States and the Soviet Union. That conference is the outcome of the decision reached at Yalta that the foreign ministers of the great powers involved in the war should meet every once in so often, I think it is every three or four months, to become—I do not say better acquainted with each other—better acquainted through conferring with one another, with all aspects of questions as they come up.

President Truman himself has said that he does not think there should be any more peace settlements by the great powers alone. In that connection I am sure the President was referring to a peace conference and the final settlement of peace terms. Canada has made her position very clearly known in that connection. In regard to matters that relate to the peace we expect to have all the powers recognize the great part which Canada played in this war, the great sacrifice of life that has been made, all that has contributed to victory on the part of our armed services, to say nothing of the much lesser but nevertheless very important contributions that Canada has made in the way of furnishing supplies, making loans, in fact giving assistance where it was needed without any consideration. We do expect and will expect that this country shall be given full recognition along with other powers that may have to do with these international matters that affect the future.

May I deal with the last subject to which my hon. friend referred before going on to the

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

other two questions he asked? I think it would be all to the good to have the estimates of the Department of External Affairs referred to the committee on external affairs. That committee was formerly known as the committee on industrial and international relations, but its designation was changed at the beginning of this session. My impression is that I suggested at a previous session that we should refer the estimates of the Department of External Affairs to the committee on industrial and international relations. I know that I did advocate that course in regard to the estimates of different departments, namely, that they should be referred to committees, and I did so for two reasons; first, in order that all members might be better informed on the work of the government in these matters and also because I believe it would involve a real saving in time in taking up the estimates themselves. I agree with my hon. friend that if the committee does go into these matters and takes up the estimates of any department—I am speaking now particularly of External Affairs—that should not preclude the fullest discussion on any of the items for external affairs when the report of the committee comes back to the house. I do think that the committee of supply might well decide that there are a large number of these items which the standing committee had gone into so fully that there was no need of bringing them up again here and taking up the time of the house, but that it would rather pick out the items which it was felt should receive attention here.

The leader of the opposition also asked whether it was the intention to reappoint the committee on the revision of the rules of the house. I would answer him now by saying that that committee will certainly be reappointed, and I hope that it will consider very carefully how time can be saved in the House of Commons by a revision of the rules in some respects along the lines I have already suggested. The recommendation of the committee to which my hon. friend referred was that it be empowered to consider matters connected with external affairs and to report from time to time any suggestions or recommendations to the House of Commons. I think that was construed as being something very broad and as rather a departure from the rules we follow generally in the house; namely, that when matters are referred to committees, they are referred to them specifically. For example, this committee on external affairs in its report referred to certain conventions they approved, and there were also the treaty of extradition and