

Inquiries of the Ministry

would undoubtedly accept a motion to proceed with a subject of that kind if it were presented by the government.

Mr. M. J. Coldwell (Rosetown-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I think considerable confusion has been caused in the past by intervention of other business in the course of the debate on the address in reply to the speech from the throne. I do not think it has facilitated the business of the house at all. Last year, I remember, there was considerable criticism on this side of the house—I think from all parties—because of the manner in which the traditional procedure was changed. I have great sympathy with what the leader of the opposition (Mr. Drew) has said regarding these problems. Nevertheless I believe that the debate on the address in reply to the speech from the throne is the first, and indeed the main, opportunity for private members to express to the government what they, and through them their constituents, are thinking about the problems that have arisen.

While we should make every effort to shorten the debate as much as we possibly can—and it is a very difficult thing to do—nevertheless by continuing the debate we would facilitate the business of the house, the government would understand the views of private members and of the people of the country, and in the end we would be further ahead if we disposed of the address first and then took up these vital problems in the order that has been mentioned.

There is one other method that could be adopted by members of the opposition or members on the government side of the house if they so desired, if they felt these matters were of sufficient interest to justify a statement from the minister concerned. Amendments could be moved from time to time. It has been my experience in the past that when we have interrupted the debate on the address to do something else we have not facilitated the business of the house—indeed I think we have rather delayed it.

WHEAT**QUESTION AS TO FINAL PAYMENT ON
FIVE-YEAR POOL**

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert Fair (Battle River): May I ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce when the wheat growers of the prairie provinces may expect the final payment under the five-year wheat pool, and whether the government has made up its mind what it will contribute toward making up the losses sustained by those farmers? If the amount has been determined, how much will it be?

Right Hon. C. D. Howe (Minister of Trade and Commerce): I am not able at this time to make a statement regarding the five-year pool.

Mr. Wright: If I may ask a supplementary question, is the government still carrying on negotiations with the United Kingdom government with respect to any further payment under what is commonly known as the "have regard" clause in the four-year British contract?

Mr. Howe: I am not able to make a statement on that subject today.

Mr. Ross (Souris): If I may ask a further supplementary question, could the Prime Minister say whether negotiations have been reopened with the British government in regard to a final settlement of the United Kingdom-Canada wheat agreement and the five-year pool?

Right Hon. L. S. St. Laurent (Prime Minister): I will not say that negotiations have been opened with the government of the United Kingdom in that regard, but representations were made as to what I thought was the view prevailing throughout the wheat-producing provinces of Canada in regard to the fulfilment of all obligations under the four-year contract.

CHINA**INQUIRY AS TO PROHIBITION OF EXPORT
OF CANADIAN FUNDS**

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. K. Fraser (Peterborough West): In view of the communist blackmailing of friends and relatives of Canadians in China, has the government considered the prohibition of export of Canadian funds to communist China?

Hon. Douglas Abbott (Minister of Finance): The matter has not been given consideration up to the present time.

ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY**INQUIRY AS TO CONSTRUCTION BY CANADA ALONE**

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Gordon Graydon (Peel): In view of certain government statements made during the recess, I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether it is the intention of the Canadian government to proceed alone with the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway if the United States congress does not, within a reasonable time, offer its co-operation in that regard.

Right Hon. L. S. St. Laurent (Prime Minister): The prospects of co-operation