

Inquiries of the Ministry

whether they are generous enough for their dependents; whether the benefits that are provided when they are discharged are sufficient. Those are matters which will be discussed in this house when the estimates are being considered, but they are not matters which come within the check on expenditures or commitments for expenditure of the moneys provided by parliament to implement the policies recommended by the government. I did not take it that the hon. gentlemen opposite were expressing their desire that we have a committee that would operate as do the committees in the United States congress. We have taken the stand that, as far as we could prevent it, we would not agree to have that kind of committee set up. They discussed with me and determined the terms of a reference which would provide for a full examination of the expenditures and commitments for expenditure. I think that the hon. member for Red Deer was right when he suggested that it would be the duty of the members of the committee not to be looking for reasons to criticize but to be looking for something that would be constructive, and that there would be on the other side a duty on the majority members of the committee, representing the party that supports the government, not to block any investigation into some field that might disclose that an error had been committed and should be rectified. I think that the committee will be conscious of its responsibility and will wish to act in a manner that will justify the expression used by one of the hon. members this afternoon, namely that it will be the watch dog for the whole Canadian public with regard to the proper expenditure of the money being raised from the whole Canadian public.

Motion agreed to.

WHEAT**STORAGE FACILITIES AT CHURCHILL—REQUEST FOR ENLARGEMENT**

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. R. Knight (Saskatoon): Mr. Speaker, in view of the shortage of grain storage facilities that has arisen, I want to ask a question of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Howe). I do not see him in his place. Perhaps the parliamentary assistant would take notice of it. Has the minister recently received representations from the Saskatchewan wheat pools as to enlarging the storage facilities for grain at the port of Churchill? Does the government propose to take any action in that regard? The parliamentary assistant is not in the house—

Right Hon. L. S. St. Laurent (Prime Minister): I shall be glad to bring the hon.

[Mr. St. Laurent.]

member's question to the attention of the Minister of Trade and Commerce who, I am sure, will wish to give him a full answer.

EXTRADITION**SUPPLEMENTARY CONVENTION—CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. G. Diefenbaker (Lake Centre): In connection with the supplementary convention dealing with the extradition of fugitive criminals, and in particular with stockateers and racketeers in share sales, I should like to ask either the Prime Minister or the Minister of Justice whether the convention that has been signed provides that there shall be no extradition except for offences that are offences under Canadian as well as United States law?

If I may be allowed to do so, Mr. Speaker, may I say that this question arises because of the fact that some years ago the question arose whether or not the extradition law was going to be amended, and at that time the convention would have allowed extradition for offences created in forty-eight states.

The second question I should like to ask the minister, in connection with the extradition convention that was signed on October 26, is whether or not that will be effectual or operative until such time as it is passed as a treaty by the United States senate. Those are two questions that I think should be answered. In asking the question I would also suggest to the Prime Minister that the convention be tabled.

Right Hon. L. S. St. Laurent (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman was kind enough to call my attention, last Friday I think it was, to an article published in the *Financial Post* and referring to this convention. As hon. members know, this matter has been under discussion for a long time, and it is to take the form of a treaty which cannot become operative until ratification has been authorized by the senate of the United States, under their constitution. It had been hoped that the supplementary convention could be signed early enough to have it dealt with before congress adjourned, but that was not found to be possible. It was signed on October 26 and it does not become effective until ratified according to the constitutional processes of the two countries. In the United States it requires the authorization of the senate. Under our constitution it does not require parliamentary action but it is, and always has been, the intention of the government to bring it before parliament for