

the British commonwealth of nations. That is an aspect of the situation which I mention simply in order that my hon. friend may see that it is not simply a matter of relations between Canada and other countries on this continent.

Mr. MacINNIS: If I may ask one other question, has the representative from Canada to the Soviet Union been appointed as yet, or is the Prime Minister in a position to make any statement.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: A day or two ago I mentioned to the leader of the opposition that as soon as parliament adjourned I hoped to have an opportunity of continuing some conversations I have had already with different persons concerning Canada's representation in the Soviet Union. I am hoping that I may be able to make an announcement very shortly; and that applies to our representation in China as well.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Is the representative of the Soviet Union in this country at the present time?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I understand he is expecting to be here shortly. The soviet minister designate to Ottawa is Mr. Fyodor Gusev. Mr. Gusev is at present head of the second European department of the commissariat for foreign affairs, which deals with Russian relations with the British Commonwealth. It is stated that he is to arrive in Canada towards the end of September, but we have no direct advice on the point.

Mr. COLDWELL: I notice that the other day the Hon. Walter Nash, at Washington, had proposed that the united nations set up what he called a world war council, and with it a council for world reconstruction. Is that Mr. Nash's proposal, made by himself, or is it being considered by the governments associating in the present war? If so, what is the attitude of the Canadian government to such proposal?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I believe it was in London that the statement was made, was it not?

Mr. COLDWELL: Probably.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I cannot say whether Mr. Nash is speaking for himself or for someone else. However, I should be inclined to think he was speaking entirely for himself.

Mr. COLDWELL: The Prime Minister knows nothing about it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No.

Mr. MAYBANK: I should like to speak upon something which is really only a detail in connection with the operations of the department. It is not the type of matter which has been before the committee up to this time. I believe the Prime Minister has a memorandum respecting this matter. I refer to the case of a young woman who worked for the department, in Canada House, for about ten years. She returned to Canada from the old country, and found herself unable to go back to the old country again. Her return was prevented either because of our own or British regulations. Being unable to return, she was forced to take temporary work, first in one department in Canada and then in another. Her second temporary position was in the same Department of External Affairs.

After eight or nine months had expired she married, expecting that she would receive around \$500 or \$600 in superannuation moneys. However, she did not and apparently cannot receive those moneys. Before the Prime Minister replies I should like to go a step further into the facts as I have them. This young woman, as I say, worked for nearly ten years and returned to Canada. Canada would not let her return to her position in the old country, for reasons not in any way connected either with her or her services. Then, finding herself in a position where she had to work at something, she sought the advice of the civil service commission, and was advised by them that if she did take temporary work she would not lose her superannuation money.

Thereupon she took temporary work, but found, after quitting that work, that she had lost her superannuation money. The temporary position was taken on the distinct understanding that those moneys would not be lost to her, but when she got married they were lost. This matter has been before the treasury board, and for once I am bound to say, that, according to my information, the treasury board acted more or less humanely. I understand their attitude was that the moneys should be paid. I am at a loss to understand how the treasury board could hold such a belief, and the money remain unpaid, because I have always understood that the treasury board is all powerful. Certainly in a negative sense it is always all-powerful, and inasmuch as its operations are nearly always negative one is surprised to find a case where it has not the power. In this instance, however, it would appear that the treasury board was favourable to the payment of the money, but some difficulties developed in respect of the legal aspects of the case.