

*Inquiries of the Ministry*

**Mr. Homuth:** I was paired with the Minister of Labour.

**Mr. Cardiff:** I was paired. Had I voted, I would have voted against the motion.

**Mr. Casselman:** I was paired with the hon. member for Portage-Neepawa (Mr. Weir). Had I voted, I would have voted against the motion.

**Mr. White (Middlesex East):** I was paired with the hon. member for Middlesex West (Mr. McCubbin). Had I voted, I would have voted against the motion.

**HOUSING****INCREASED RENTALS—COMMUNICATIONS FROM PROVINCES**

On the orders of the day:

**Mr. M. J. Coldwell (Rosetown-Biggar):** In the absence of the Minister of Finance, I should like to direct a question to his parliamentary assistant. Have any communications been received from any of the provinces regarding the announcement of rent increases? If so, from which provinces have communications been received, and will copies of that correspondence be supplied?

**Mr. James Sinclair (Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister of Finance):** I shall draw the attention of the minister to the hon. member's question when he returns.

**INCREASED RENTALS—LIABILITY OF TENANTS TO FURTHER INCREASES ON DECEMBER 15**

**Mr. James Sinclair (Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister of Finance):** I should like to answer a question asked by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) last Friday. It reads as follows:

Are tenants who have had their rents increased by maximum rental decisions made since the minister made his announcement on November 3 liable to further increases on or after December 15?

The answer is yes. The increases announced by the minister on November 3 would apply to the actual amount of the rent in effect on December 15.

**Mr. Knowles:** May I ask a supplementary question? Will the parliamentary assistant take up with the minister the possibility of amending the order so as to give some reprieve to those people who have had one increase since November 3, so that any further increase might at least be delayed?

**Mr. Sinclair:** The only increase which could have been granted since November 3 is a special increase granted as one of the six special classes for which rental increases can be authorized by a decision of the board. There has been no change of policy affecting those increases since November 3 which

would make them any different from those which were authorized immediately before November 3.

**Mr. Knowles:** There may be a difference, but it is still tough on the tenant.

**CHINA****QUESTION AS TO RECOGNITION OF COMMUNIST GOVERNMENT**

On the orders of the day:

**Mr. George A. Drew (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Pearson), I should like to direct to the Prime Minister a question of which I have not given him notice. I hope it is one which can be answered without formal notice having been extended. Today's press carries reports to the effect that eight nations of the commonwealth agreed last week to recognize the Moscow-dominated communist government of China. Is the Prime Minister in a position to inform the house whether or not that statement is correct? If it is not correct, will there be an opportunity for the house to debate this question before such recognition is extended?

**Right Hon. L. S. St. Laurent (Prime Minister):** I shall have to make inquiries about that. I must confess I was quite as surprised as the leader of the opposition on hearing such a report over the radio yesterday. No dispatch to that effect has come to my attention. Just as soon as there is any development in that regard, I shall see that the Secretary of State for External Affairs, or the Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs informs the house. So far as I know, the position is as stated by the Secretary of State for External Affairs when he made his address to the house.

**TRANS-CANADA HIGHWAY****CORRESPONDENCE WITH PROVINCES AS TO CHOICE OF ROUTE**

On the orders of the day:

**Mr. J. G. Diefenbaker (Lake Centre):** On October 3 an order for return was passed for the correspondence that passed between the dominion and provincial governments relative to the location of the trans-Canada highway. Will the minister say whether or not he is at present in a position, in view of the fact that the debate on this subject will now take place, to table the correspondence requested and directed by that return?

**Hon. Robert H. Winters (Minister of Reconstruction and Supply):** Mr. Speaker, the reason for not tabling the correspondence is that the permission of all the provinces has