

*International Wheat Agreement*

London Times of April 16, 1953, and reads as follows:

The reason why the government have decided not to accede to the international wheat agreement was explained in the House of Commons yesterday by Major Lloyd George, minister of food.

Answering a question by Mr. Osborne, Conservative member for Louth, Major Lloyd George said:

By a majority vote the international wheat council has decided to recommend to member governments that the international wheat agreement be extended for a further three-year period at a new price range per bushel of \$2.05 maximum and \$1.55 minimum, to replace the present range of \$1.80 maximum and \$1.20 minimum. After mature consideration Her Majesty's government have decided not to accede to the new agreement. In the judgment of Her Majesty's government the maximum price of \$1.80 written into the present agreement—with the valuable insurance afforded by the guarantee at the minimum price—is a fair reflection of the value of wheat in present conditions in a free market. We were nevertheless prepared, in a sincere attempt to reach a settlement acceptable to all, to agree to an increase of 20 cents in the maximum price—and an increase of 35 cents in the minimum price—in spite of the heavy additional dollar expenditure this would have involved. Her Majesty's government consider that this would provide a generous settlement and feel unable to go further.

I would point out that the price written into the agreement is \$1.80 plus carrying charges, so that the price is \$1.86 when compared with the price of \$2.05 maximum, which includes the carrying charges. I quote from the statement:

We were nevertheless prepared, in a sincere attempt to reach a settlement acceptable to all, to agree to an increase of 20 cents—

If that is the case, then Britain should have signed the agreement. I offer that as an indication that whoever was advising the minister perhaps did not understand the terms of the present agreement or how the proposed agreement would operate. I point that out in all sincerity, for I cannot see any other reason why Britain should not have signed the agreement.

Having said that, I want to say it is entirely optional with Britain as to whether or not she signs the agreement. It is her decision. Canada has not attempted in any way to interfere with that decision other than to put the facts before the officials who have visited Ottawa. I think it would have been inappropriate to do more than that. There is still time for Britain to accede. She can do that up until July 15 next. The decision that she has taken has been announced in ringing tones, and whether she will accede is very doubtful, in my opinion. However, I do hope that before finally deciding against accession she will reconsider the whole position, in the light of developments between now and then.

Motion agreed to.

[Mr. Howe.]

## LABOUR CONDITIONS

STRIKE OF GRAIN HANDLERS IN VANCOUVER—  
REQUEST FOR GOVERNMENT ACTION

On the orders of the day:

**Mr. J. S. Sinnott (Springfield):** I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour, but since neither he nor his parliamentary assistant is in the house perhaps it can be taken as notice and answered tomorrow. My question is related to the serious tie-up of shipping in the port of Vancouver in the past seven days as a result of the strike of grain handlers. My question is, will the minister take whatever action may be necessary to enable the grain ships in Vancouver to be loaded at once?

## THE CORONATION

## SUGGESTION AS TO PARDONING OF PRISONERS

On the orders of the day:

**Mr. W. J. Browne (St. John's West):** In view of the recent announcement in Great Britain concerning the pardoning of prisoners in view of the coronation of Queen Elizabeth, will the same thing take place in Canada?

**Hon. Stuart S. Garson (Minister of Justice):** I am afraid I did not hear the first part of the hon. member's question.

**Mr. Browne (St. John's West):** In view of the recent announcement regarding the pardoning of prisoners, will the same principle be applied in Canada in view of the coronation of Queen Elizabeth?

**Mr. Garson:** The usual practice in connection with such amnesties is that they are announced in due course by the Secretary of State. Further comment by me now would be inappropriate.

**Mr. Knowles:** The matter is covered in a proclamation which has already been published on page 1153 of the *Canada Gazette* of April 25, 1953.

## TRANS-CANADA AIR LINES

RESTRICTION OF MOVEMENT OF PASSENGERS  
AT HARMON FIELD

On the orders of the day:

**Mr. G. F. Higgins (St. John's East):** May I direct a question to the Minister of Justice which does not appear in the *Canada Gazette*, but which did appear in another newspaper. Is there any truth in the statement that Canadians were refused permission to leave Harmon Field following a flight in a T.C.A. aircraft some few weeks ago? Does the minister know anything more about the matter now than he did two weeks ago?