

March 1, 1944, relating to the appointment of Mr. James Leslie as a chief investigator for the inspection staff of the wartime labour relations board, including a copy of all correspondence with trade union organizations relating to the said appointment.

MONETARY CONFERENCE

INQUIRY AS TO CANADA'S REPRESENTATIVE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Leader of the Opposition): I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Finance arising out of a report respecting representation of the United States and Canada respectively at the united nations monetary and financial conference. I wish first to make my protest, and then shall ask the minister a question.

The delegation from Canada, apart from the cabinet delegates, the departmental and technical experts who normally go to conferences of the kind, included two admirable and highly esteemed members of the house, the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Tucker) and the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Blanchette). I should not like any one in the house or outside of it to feel that I raise this question because of my views respecting the qualifications of these two hon. members. This matter might have passed unnoticed had it not been for the fact that while Canada sent two private members and supporters of the government, and no supporter from any other party was either invited or allowed to attend, the situation in the United States was entirely the reverse. This will be borne out by the following quotation from the *Wall Street Journal* of June 30, 1944, which in one paragraph states:

The congressional delegation consists of the Chairmen (Democrats) and ranking minority (Republicans) members of the senate and house banking committees. Senate representatives are Messrs. Wagner of New York, a Democrat, and Tobey of New Hampshire, a Republican.

The article goes on to speak about the qualifications of these men. Then it says:

The house members are representative Spence, a Democrat of Kentucky, and representative Wolcott of Michigan, a Republican.

In drawing this situation to the attention of the government I protest against the government's failure to include in the delegation representatives of other political thought, as was done in respect of the United States delegation. Someone has suggested that the government might have chosen the hon. member for Parry Sound (Mr. Slaght) and the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard (Mr. McGeer)—but I did not rise specially to advocate that. I am advocating, however, that

the government should have proceeded as the United States did in the selection of their delegates.

I do not raise this question from the merely party political point of view. But I do think, if I may say so, that the next government in Canada, which we believe will be our party, should have had representation at the conference as well as the party at present in office. Will the minister tell the house why this was not done?

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): I do not think it occurred to anybody, when selecting a delegation from among members of parliament, to select delegates from any but the government party.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Why?

Mr. ILSLEY: I understand there is no precedent for it in respect of similar conferences.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The United States did it.

Mr. ILSLEY: I am talking about Canadian precedents. An entirely different system obtains in the United States of America. This government will have to decide toward the close of the conference what its position will be, and will have to do so on the advice of its delegation. If a representative were taken from the Progressive Conservative party, then it seems to me the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation party would have a fairly good claim to have their school of thought represented, as would also the Social Credit party.

Mr. HANSELL: Hear, hear.

Mr. ILSLEY: I beg the hon' gentleman's pardon?

Mr. HANSELL: Hear, hear, I say.

Mr. ILSLEY: If the Social Credit party had been asked to nominate a member he would have gone according to the statement of the Premier of Alberta, with one view in mind, and that would have been to prevent the conference from obtaining its objective. It had been known for a long time that this conference was to be held, and if the matter had been brought up in the house we certainly could have given it consideration. Other matters of this kind are brought up in the house from time to time, and I do not think it ever occurred to the house leader of the Progressive Conservative party—

Mr. GRAYDON: May I answer that? The reason it did not occur to us at the beginning was that we were unaware there was to be a representation from the House of Commons. At least I did not know of it.