

treaty had interfered with the operations of firms in his constituency. It cannot have interfered yet, and it will not interfere with anything done in Canada until it becomes effective, and it will not become effective until instruments of ratification have been exchanged between the high contracting parties. But as to the reason for not bringing it to parliament before this year, the fact is that the protocol had not been arranged before this year. The treaty became public and became the subject of objections as soon as it was signed, and those objections were for a very long time under discussion. It was not until October of this year that the protocol was arranged to restrict its application when it did become effective; and after that protocol had been arranged, both the treaty and the protocol were brought to the houses of parliament for their consideration before the government would undertake to exchange instruments of ratification. When it was brought to this house it was referred to the committee on external affairs. Many of the objections that had been urged against the treaty in its original form were repeated against the treaty as modified by the protocol. The committee on external affairs has reported the evidence and has recommended that both the treaty and the protocol be reconsidered. There has not yet been time to give consideration to that recommendation of the committee on external affairs. Until there has been time to give consideration to that recommendation of the committee, and also to the evidence that was adduced, there will certainly not be any exchange of instruments of ratification, and I would be very much surprised if it did not again come before the committee on external affairs before the government undertook to make the exchange of instruments of ratification.

Mr. HACKETT: I wish to tell the minister that if I said that the treaty had interfered with enterprise in my constituency I said something I did not intend to say, and I do not think I did say it. I said that the treaty was in such terms that, were it ratified in the form in which it now stands, it would have that effect. I should like to make this suggestion to the minister. I understood from the Prime Minister that all the resources of the department had been called into play in the negotiation of the treaty. If that be true, may I, with the utmost respect for the department, suggest that they go a little outside it for inspiration when the document is being redrafted, if it be redrafted, because it is quite evident that those who dealt with the matter were neophytes who had never had anything to do with extradition and were pos-

sibly not very much interested in it. I suggest, therefore, that when the matter is taken up afresh, the usual care of the department be exercised in availing itself of all help that can be had to make a treaty which will be in the general interests of Canada.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): May I ask the Prime Minister a question with regard to the basis on which the number and character of our representatives in different foreign countries are determined. I have in my hand a white paper entitled, "Canadian Representatives Abroad", dated October 1, 1945, and it seems to include both diplomatic and trade representatives. On what basis is our representation determined? Is it on the extent of business generally, or perhaps business anticipated, or the nature and importance of our diplomatic relationship with the respective countries? The reason for the question is that I do not find it immediately apparent why our representation as set out in this document is as it is. For instance, we have one representative in India, a trade commissioner; one representative in Luxembourg, a minister; one in Greenland who is a vice consul; four representatives in Peru, all of whom are diplomatic; twelve representatives in France, who are apparently all diplomatic, although one or two are referred to as commercial attachés, none of them being referred to as trade-commissioners; five diplomatic representatives and three trade commissioners in Australia; in Brazil five representatives; diplomatic, and no trade commissioners. In Sweden we have no trade representatives at all, although we have in Norway. It is not immediately apparent on what basis we selected these. Some of the results seem surprising, and it is a matter of interest to me, and as a matter of public interest I wonder if the Prime Minister would be good enough to explain the basis on which representation abroad is determined.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: A variety of considerations have governed in this matter. As my hon. friend is aware, prior to the war certain legations were opened. Some of them have since become embassies. They were opened in a limited number of countries, but during the war a large number of representatives of other countries came to reside in Canada, and, where opportunity was afforded, the government gave assurances that when the appropriate time came we would reciprocate in the matter of representation. That would account for some of the countries to which representatives have not yet been appointed where they otherwise would have been appointed. In connection with each mission I