

*Inquiries of the Ministry*

going on this afternoon, and when there is anything further to report I will be very glad to bring it to the attention of the house.

**Mr. Martin (Essex East):** I did not understand the last part of my hon. friend's statement. Did he say anything about the question whether Canada was going to participate in the conference suggested by Prince Sihanouk of Cambodia?

**Mr. Green:** I also made the statement some days ago that I thought, for a long term settlement, it would be wise to reconvene the Geneva conference. There was a good deal of opposition to that being done. In addition there has been the suggestion that there should be a broadened Geneva conference made up by adding countries in the area which are neutral, for example Burma and Thailand. Several of the Asian countries have been proposed. Whether agreement will be reached to recall the original conference or to call an expanded conference, I do not know. This is one of the questions which is already under discussion.

**Hon. J. M. Macdonnell (Greenwood):** The minister mentioned the representatives from Canada and India. Did he mention the representative from Poland?

**Mr. Green:** I did not mention the one from Poland because I cannot pronounce his name. I have not it with me at the moment. He is a very distinguished gentleman, now in the Polish foreign office.

**POWER****COLUMBIA RIVER—MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT UNDER STANDING ORDER 26**

**Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West):** I ask leave to move the adjournment of the house under standing order 26 for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of public importance, namely the unnecessary and unseemly haste on the part of the government of Canada in making arrangements for the signing of a treaty between the government of Canada and the government of the United States to provide for certain developments on the Columbia river in Canada.

I ask leave to move the adjournment because there will be no opportunity during this debate to discuss this question adequately, and because there will be a delay of months, without doubt, before an agreement is signed with the government of British Columbia.

**Hon. E. D. Fulton (Minister of Justice):** I am sure Your Honour would feel that the question of urgency which it is necessary to establish before accepting this motion will have been disposed of by what the Prime Minister has said, namely that the treaty will

be submitted to this house with the suggestion that it be submitted in turn to the external affairs committee before there is any question of ratification. There is no treaty in existence until the document has been signed. The house has the assurance that before the treaty becomes effective, before ratification is made, the house will have the opportunity for the fullest discussion and the fullest information through the medium of the committee procedure. It is therefore surely obvious that there is no urgency for debate at this time in the way in which that term is used in connection with a motion to adjourn the house to discuss a matter of urgent public importance.

It is suggested to me—I was looking at the rule at the time—that the hon. gentleman has apparently become so confused about dates generally that he has also got his motion before the house at the wrong time according to the rule which now prevails.

**Mr. Speaker:** Unless the hon. member for Kootenay West has an answer to the observations of the Minister of Justice I am prepared to dispose of this request.

**Mr. Herridge:** I only wish to say that I congratulate the Minister of Justice on trying to make a good case out of a bad case.

**Mr. Speaker:** If the earlier statements about this treaty had not been before the house there might, perhaps, have been some doubt in my mind as to whether we should interrupt our proceedings to discuss this matter; but, as has been pointed out, the treaty, when signed, has to come before the house and until then there is nothing which can come before us. It seems to me that the necessary urgency does not exist in this case, and I regret that I must refuse the hon. member's request for leave to move this motion.

**Mr. Herridge:** I appeal Your Honour's ruling.

**Mr. Speaker:** I think it is well settled that the decision of the Speaker under rule 26 does not involve a point of order and cannot therefore be appealed.

**FLOODS****BRITISH COLUMBIA—REQUEST FOR REPORT ON DAMAGE**

On the orders of the day:

**Mr. Erhart Regier (Burnaby-Coquitlam):** I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether he is in a position to make a brief report on the heavy damage arising from the recent heavy rains in the lower mainland of British Columbia.