

one or two other matters which they considered. I think that is the right way in which to refer matters to a committee.

But with regard to External Affairs there is one very special reason why care must be taken as to the extent to which the committee might be authorized to go in investigating External Affairs generally. My hon. friend knows that in the Department of External Affairs there is a great deal of correspondence with different governments on matters that are under consideration and one thing above everything else that we have to watch is to see that where other governments are concerned their consent is obtained in advance of the disclosure of information that may be the subject of communication between those governments and our own. The committee might quite unconsciously, unless there was someone watching the situation pretty carefully, be going into some matters about which, if they were brought up in the House of Commons instead of in the committee the minister in charge would have to take responsibility. But I do not press that consideration too far. I think that what my hon. friend has in mind is that if the estimates as a whole were referred to a committee it could bring before it the officials of the External Affairs Department and if they had doubt as to the propriety to certain matters arising in the committee the matter could be considered and dealt with by the minister in the house. I am happy to join with my hon. friend in the move to have the estimates of External Affairs referred to the standing committee and I would hope that that committee might, as I have already suggested, bring down to a few topics the matters which subsequently need to be referred to in the House of Commons. Possibly later, when we call this particular resolution, and the amendment which has been proposed to refer the matter back for consideration the amendment might be allowed to pass as the committee will not be meeting again before another session.

My hon. friend asked me about Canada's position in certain key negotiations. I have touched on that to a limited extent. I cannot emphasize too strongly the right of this country to be one of the principals in any matters that have grown out of the war and relate to the making of the peace. I can assure him that we shall watch the situation carefully and press for our rights in that regard.

My hon. friend has made reference to Canada's policy in the Pacific. I had anticipated

that some questions would be asked in regard to the Pacific and I should like to answer his question as follows:

I should like to summarize briefly the situation with respect to the occupation and control of Japan. It will be recalled that, in October, Canada was invited to participate in the work of the far eastern advisory commission, a body convened in Washington to consider political matters connected with the fulfilment by Japan of its obligations under the instrument of surrender. The invitation was accepted, as the house was informed, and the Canadian ambassador in Washington was named as Canadian representative. A number of preliminary meetings have been held which have been chiefly devoted to examining the manifold problems with which the committee will have to deal and discussing the way in which its work can most profitably be arranged. The members taking part in these meetings, in addition to Canada, are the United Kingdom, the United States, China, Australia, France, India, the Philippine commonwealth, the Netherlands and New Zealand.

So far, the Soviet Union has not sent a representative to the commission, but it is my understanding that discussions are now proceeding between the four powers signatory to the Potsdam declaration with a view to reconciling certain differences of opinion which have been expressed over methods of procedure. It is hoped that these discussions will result in the attendance of a Soviet representative, which will be genuinely welcomed by all.

It is premature as yet to attempt to predict, with any exactness, how the far eastern advisory commission will function and what role it will play. The important thing is that machinery has been created which will provide for joint discussions by all the nations directly concerned with the Pacific of the intricate and far-reaching political problems occasioned by the defeat of Japan. An opportunity is thus afforded to the Canadian government to express its views on matters of concern to it and to share in the formulation of the policies that will be applied to Japan. I am hopeful that the far eastern advisory commission will make a worth-while contribution to the problem of creating conditions which will encourage the development by the Japanese people of a peaceful and democratic government.

Canada will be represented on the far eastern advisory commission during its forthcoming visit to Japan by Mr. E. H. Norman, a member of the external affairs service. Mr. Norman served at the Canadian legation in