

Kingdom and with other nations of the commonwealth, before decisions are reached. I have no doubt that something along that line is being done at the present time, under present practice; but it must go a great deal farther. I believe that Canada could get whatever procedure she wished; that the United Kingdom and other nations of the commonwealth would follow our lead to a great extent if we suggested a change. So that, I repeat, my first question is for an explanation of Canada's position in respect of negotiations such as those being carried on at this time in Moscow.

My second question has to do with Canada's policy in the Pacific. I would ask the Prime Minister to explain the attitude of his government toward Pacific affairs. That area has increased greatly in importance. In fact, I think the centre of world activity has now shifted from Europe, certainly to America and perhaps to the Pacific.

During the course of the war against Japan the United States did a great deal to open up areas in the Pacific. Russia has expanded and she is now taking an active interest in Manchuria; she is also very active in the northern part of the Pacific. China, of course, is like a giant just awakening from a long sleep. No one can tell what developments there may be on the mainland of Asia in the next decade or generation, but it is almost certain that they will be very great.

Then, Australia and New Zealand have developed remarkably during the war. They have taken a most aggressive position in Pacific affairs, and have told the rest of the world in no uncertain language just what they think their part should be in that area. What is Canada's policy on such questions as the allied advisory commission on Japan, which has been set up in Washington? Apparently the Russians wanted to have an allied control commission, functioning not in Washington but right in Tokyo. What position is Canada taking on that suggestion?

Are we in favour of a regional council for the Pacific? Some of the nations have been suggesting that there should be a council for that region, and Canada should take some position on the question. It is, of course, of vital interest to those Canadians who live on the Pacific slope. We should like to know what the Canadian government has in mind about a regional council for the Pacific. There is much to be said for such a council, because there are many problems which are peculiar to the Pacific area.

Then, what is Canada's policy with regard to a united nations trusteeship of the former

Japanese territories in the Pacific area? That, again, is a most important question; and we should like to know whether or not the government believes that such trusteeship should be established.

My third question has to do with the work of the house itself in connection with external affairs. This year for the first time there was set up an external affairs committee. It is a very good committee, and the members who served on it took their work most seriously. On November 12, when the Prime Minister was away, that committee brought in a report, the last paragraph of which read as follows:

Your committee further recommends that it be empowered to consider matters connected with external affairs and report from time to time any suggestion or recommendation deemed advisable to the House of Commons.

That, of course, was a wide-open recommendation. The committee asked that it be given power to consider anything having to do with external affairs.

A few days later, on November 16, on a motion for concurrence, the Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent) moved in amendment that the words "be now concurred in" at the end of the motion be struck out, and replaced by the following:

That the report be referred back to the said committee and that it have power to reconsider the recommendation expressed in the last paragraph of the report.

In moving that amendment, the Minister of Justice said that he thought the new committee had gone too far and had asked for powers that were much too wide. His suggestion was that they should consider only what was referred to them by the house.

In this matter there is a clear difference of opinion. Perhaps some middle ground can be found. May I suggest to the Prime Minister that the estimates for the Department of External Affairs might very well be referred to the external affairs committee. That is done now in respect of certain items in the Department of Transport which are referred to the special committee on government-owned railways and shipping. If this were done, if these estimates were referred, it would give the committee reasonable scope in the discussion of external affairs, and at the same time would not deprive the house of the right to discuss those estimates subsequently.

This new committee must not be crippled at the outset. There was great hope for it, in the speech of my leader when he proposed that it be set up, in the speech of the Prime Minister when he accepted the proposal, and in the speeches of the leaders of the other parties.