

States; we were promised by the Prime Minister himself a day to discuss Canada's foreign policy or external affairs, and we did not get anything like a day. All we got before six o'clock was a very interesting statement by the Prime Minister, for which I thank him, and in which he went further in the direction of my thinking than I expected he would go. It was a very interesting statement. It was one that touched many angles of the problem and one that gave me a desire to discuss it. But after the Prime Minister had finished his statement at six o'clock there were just two hours left, so that the day that we were to have for external affairs boiled down to just two hours. For this reason I protest. It is impossible to go on at this time; no one feels like it and the committee is not in a mood for it. But at another session the importance of Canada's external or foreign policy should be recognized by allowing plenty of time for discussion. We spend days and weeks in fairly futile talk, and why could we not have a debate on Canada's foreign policy? It seems hard to find a real reason. In the Prime Minister's speech, which I enjoyed, the other day, in the speech made by the hon. member for Essex East (Mr. Martin), to a degree in the speeches made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth) and by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett), one could see a lack of clearness of thinking which I have and which we all have. That is, Canada is only feeling its way to a much more distinctively Canadian foreign policy than we have ever had before.

Three lines of thought showed very distinctly in at any rate three of those speeches: the collectivist or league line of thinking, which in theory we all once subscribed to, the imperialistic line of thinking, and last, the more isolationist or North American way of thinking. I am not clear and I do not believe any other hon. member is very clear about what he or she thinks Canada should do, other than we feel that Canada's foreign policy should be determined by Canada's interests and should not be too closely allied either with empire policy, or with league policy unless league policy is materially changed from what it is at the moment. I am not going on, because it is useless to do so. But I repeat that at another session not only one day but several days should be available so that the House of Commons may in some degree clarify its thinking on this subject, which is certainly a very important one, and much more important than, shall we say, the trade agreement with the United States, on which we spent a very long time.

Mr. BENNETT: The address which the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George delivered was prepared over six weeks ago. We—for I associate myself with him—have been watching for an opportunity, believing that the government would ultimately introduce a bill to ratify what had taken place. I think it was not too much to expect, when we were asking about legislation that would probably be included, but it was not introduced. As to dealing with the matter on going into supply, we had only Mondays and Tuesdays and Wednesdays. If one will look at the record he will find that the number of days we had an opportunity to do that were extremely limited. I have been waiting for an opportunity to take up what I dealt with, for instance, to-day, and the opportunity was very slow to present itself. I quite agree that the position the Prime Minister has mentioned is one of extreme difficulty, and one that I think any one of us, if we had to meet it, would find it difficult to deal with in any way, perhaps other than the way in which it was dealt with, having regard to the fact that we had a general election and it was difficult to call the house together, the slowness of making returns to writs, and matters of that kind. But it is competent for this parliament by proper enactment to express its ratification of what had taken place and make it retroactive in character, that is, to validate the order in council in that sense, and we have been doing that this session with respect to many matters, carrying the provision back to a date antecedent to that on which we legislated. I say it would have been quite competent to have done that in view of the commitments which were made in 1926, which were unanimously adopted by this house, in consequence, I think, largely of the general expressions that were made by the Prime Minister in answer to the discussion which was precipitated by the questions of the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George. That is the only observation I have to make, because I appreciate the difficulties the Prime Minister has had. My real criticism is that no validating legislation was offered to this house.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I just say that the reason no validating legislation was offered in this parliament is precisely the same as the reason why no further legislation was found to be necessary in the British parliament. The British government acted by order in council under the Treaty of Peace Act, 1919. Its action was clearly approved by the parliament of Great Britain. I think we were equally wise and sensible in adopting