

Mr. ST. LAURENT: I received a dispatch within the last couple of hours in which there is information that at the meeting of the permanent members not much progress had been made, but that though the meeting had been adjourned until tomorrow there were still consultations going on and that it was hoped some progress would be made, because the matter is on the agenda of the security council itself for an early day next week.

FOREIGN EXCHANGE CONTROL

SEIZURE OF FUNDS AT BORDER

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. A. KIDD (Kingston City): I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Finance. It has to do with a question which I submitted on January 30 last and which will be found passed as an order for return, as appears on page 1102 of *Hansard*. It relates to foreign exchange control, the seizure of funds at the border. Will the minister make a note of the question I am now asking with a view to having the answer given?

Hon. DOUGLAS ABBOTT (Minister of Finance): I will make a note of the question and see if I can give the answer.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

EMERGENCY GOLD MINING ASSISTANCE BILL— IMPORT REGULATIONS: KEROSENE REFRIGERATORS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. W. HERRIDGE (Kootenay West): I wish to direct two questions to the Minister of Finance. First, is it the intention of the government to proceed with Bill No. 7, an act respecting emergency payments to assist in meeting increased cost of production of gold? If so, when? Secondly, has a decision been reached with respect to amending the import regulations to permit the importation of kerosene refrigerators?

Hon. DOUGLAS ABBOTT (Minister of Finance): It is the intention to proceed with Bill No. 7, respecting emergency payments in connection with gold, as soon as we can reach it, and that will be as soon as we conclude discussion of the excise tax measure. As to the second question, no decision has been reached with respect to amending the import regulations to permit the importation of kerosene refrigerators, but the matter is still under active consideration.

PRECEDENCE FOR GOVERNMENT NOTICES OF MOTION AND GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Mr. STANLEY KNOWLES (Winnipeg North Centre): I wish to direct a question to the Prime Minister with reference to the business of the house. Thus far this session we have been operating, first, under the terms of a motion passed on December 8 and more recently under the terms of a motion passed on January 26. The Prime Minister knows that both those motions set aside standing order 15 and revolved around the address in reply to the speech from the throne. Now that that debate is over, the question is, do we revert to the provisions of standing order 15, or is the Prime Minister going to bring in some other motion so that the business of the house will be quite definite? If I might add a further word, it seems to me that we should get to the position where each day's order paper indicates the order of business for that day. That has not been the case for some time.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I happen to have with me the two motions to which my hon. friend has referred. The first one I have, passed on January 26, 1948, reads:

That the order for consideration of the motion for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session be considered on Wednesdays and Thursdays until disposed of, and notwithstanding the resolution passed by the house on December 8, 1947.

As soon as the debate was disposed of, that particular resolution lapsed; it ceased to exist and to have any effect. The motion passed on December 8 reads:

That the debate on the address in reply to the speech of His Excellency the Governor General to both houses of parliament be the first order of business on Monday, December 8th instant, and that this order be followed by government notices of motion and government orders notwithstanding anything in standing order 15.

That motion continues to be applicable; it applies at the present time. I am very glad my hon. friend has raised the question of the business of the house, for the reason that it enables me to make clear that the impression that I am determining the order of the business of the house is not wholly correct. The house controls its own business. What I did at the beginning of the session, in answer to hon. gentlemen opposite, was to indicate