

they are fighting. Such a council should be concerned, too, with evolving an international instrument capable of dispensing justice and enforcing law and order in the post-war world.

These are not Anglo-American problems alone; they are the common problems of all the united nations. It is sometimes argued that we are represented now by the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom. That is not my view, nor is it the view of Australia, as Prime Minister Curtin's speech to the people of the United States made abundantly clear. Those of us who heard that speech last week will remember the unmistakable manner in which he expressed his views over the air, speaking not to the government of the United States, not to its great President, but, as he said, appealing directly to the people of the United States. I suggest that Canada should join her voice to those of China, Australia and the other nations who are urging the formation of an executive council of the united nations. A united purpose to win the war, a united purpose to rebuild the world is essential to the well-being of mankind, but it is manifestly impossible to go into these matters at length to-day. I am asking the Prime Minister now to arrange for an early debate on the place of Canada in the council and strategy of the united nations.

It is, I think, significant that last year the speech from the throne made no reference to the fate of our army which we had dispatched to Hong Kong, and this year no reference is made to the gallant and major part played by the Canadian soldiers at Dieppe. I understand that the Dieppe attack was reviewed carefully at Westminster. It should be reviewed equally carefully by this house, because in the main our own men were involved. This house, too, should be made aware of the extent of the submarine menace to our shipping, of the steps taken to defend our coasts and coastal waters, and to what extent, if at all, we rely on the United States army for the defence of any of the vital strategic defence areas of this country or just beyond it. The government must decide whether all this should be done in open or closed session, but the time has come when hon. members should insist on a complete report to this parliament. In view of Canada's contribution to the common cause we should not allow ourselves to become the mere satellite of any of our major allies. Because of our peculiar position between the two great Anglo-Saxon nations, because of the fact that we are not interested in the building up of any sort of imperialism, and because of the fact that across the north

[Mr. Coldwell.]

of our country stretches the main air route between the great populated areas of the world, Canada's voice may be of more importance in the future than most of us can realize now.

My time is just about up, but in my concluding remarks there are one or two other things that I want to say. I am glad to note that the Prime Minister is thinking of relieving his ministers of some of the work and duties in this house. We are told in the speech from the throne that assistance will be given to them. I have suggested on more than one occasion in former years that the government adopt in this house the British system of under-secretaries, not only because I believe it would relieve the ministers, but because I believe it is good that the younger members of the party in power should have an opportunity of gaining that experience which is essential in an institution of this description. I therefore am very glad to welcome the proposal of the Prime Minister. It has been made before; it has been supported in this house from all quarters of the house before; and I sincerely hope that this time the suggestion will be carried out, not only as a war measure but as a policy of future governments in this country.

I was disappointed, however, to hear the Prime Minister say that he thought a revision of the rules of the house ought not to be undertaken during this period of war. I saw, as did the hon. member for Parry Sound (Mr. Slaght) who is sitting right opposite me tonight, His Majesty the King read the speech from the throne in Great Britain at eleven o'clock one morning. We went to the commons gallery and we heard the mover and the seconder of the address; we heard the leader of the Labour opposition; we heard the leader of the Liberal party; we heard the first ten minutes of Mr. Churchill's speech as Prime Minister; and we were on our way to luncheon shortly after one o'clock. In two hours that business had passed through the British house. I have read the rules of some of our sister nations, New Zealand, for example, where the rules have been changed in comparatively recent years; and in my opinion if we would modernize the rules we could do very much in this house without interfering whatsoever with freedom of expression or freedom of speech.

After what I have said, I do not want to transgress the rules of the house by going beyond my time limit as I am apt to do; but I want to say again, Mr. Speaker, that other matters connected with the government's proposals will be dealt with by my colleagues when they have an opportunity to speak.