

been given an opportunity to discuss them here. In my humble view the man who has done most to promote Canadian trade is not any one of those who have been with the Canadian delegation engaged in argument and discussion in Geneva. It is our own Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. MacKinnon) who has been around the world trying to promote Canadian trade. What he has done is absolutely in conflict with the Geneva agreements which provide for multi-lateral trade, which is an absurdity. Multi-lateral trade is just an auction. When we have an auction, we have a distress sale. The old practice of trade is for two people or the accredited representatives of two countries to meet together, discuss their opportunities and try to promote trade in the old-fashioned way.

I do not believe in these multilateral agreements all over the world. Now meetings are being held in Cuba, precisely because Russia is cutting the ground from under the feet of Uncle Sam, as everyone knows. It is in order to impress the South American countries that the same bureaucrats who failed at Geneva are meeting in Cuba today. We all know that Russia has offered more gold than the United States has been paying for some of the products of Yucatan and some of the products of the Argentine. But our representatives will be there; they will look at what is being done; they will understand nothing, and our trade will not be promoted at all. They will not be able to do a fraction of what has been done so well by my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce. The papers were full of him when he went to South America, and they were saying the ladies were looking at him with awe and great pleasure, admiring his genial smile. Everyone thought how fine it was to have a good Canadian coming to talk business with them.

With regard to controls, the question could be settled very easily. First, there are the feed grains which are essential but which the eastern farmers do not get because of the speculation on the part of the western farmers, who are refusing to deliver their feed grain.

Mr. COLDWELL: No, they never refused.

Mr. POULIOT: The grain was at the elevator and could not be moved because the farmers were objecting to the sale.

Mr. COLDWELL: Blame the grain exchange.

[Mr. Pouliot.]

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I would ask the hon. gentleman to keep his remarks strictly relevant to the motion before the house.

Mr. POULIOT: Yes, sir, and I only want to make a suggestion. If the government is ready to prohibit the export of feed grains from this country the price of those grains will fall at once, because the unjustifiable increase in those prices, which is causing such inconvenience to the eastern farmers, arises from the hope of selling these feed grains across the border. There is a very easy way to do that. If we have control again we shall have the same racket we had before, a racket that will benefit only the bureaucrats. Let us close the border; let us do for wheat, only in reverse, what has been done for so many United States commodities.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member again—

Mr. POULIOT: I know I am right.

Mr. SPEAKER: —but I am afraid his remarks are not relevant to the subject under discussion.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Perhaps I might be permitted to say just a word before the motion is formally put. First, I should like to make it clear that the motion relates solely to procedure and is not one that should give rise to a discussion of the various measures which are to be dealt with in the course of the parliamentary session. On the government falls the responsibility of deciding how best the business of parliament can be carried on. We are only too ready and only too happy to have suggestions from hon. gentlemen opposite, but ours is the responsibility for procedure and we must accept it. On this occasion we have tried, by conference between my colleague and the leaders on the other side, to come to some arrangement on which we could all agree. In the light of the discussion that has been taking place this afternoon, I need not say that apparently no agreement could have been reached. If one group takes one view and another group another, we are driven to the point where, whether we wish it or not, we, as a government, must decide what will be the order of business, and stand or fall by that decision. As far as the government is concerned, we are most anxious to accommodate hon. members and have both sides of the house work together. But if at this session we are to have a repetition of what we had at the last session, where a great deal of the time of parliament is being taken up with a discussion at length on various matters because of the