

Inquiries of the Ministry

the Post Office Department, with reference to the question of the night differential for post office workers.

WHEAT

REQUEST FOR INTERIM PAYMENT ON
DELIVERIES OF 1953 CROP

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. Has a representation been received from the government of Manitoba asking for an advance or interim payment on account of the wheat delivered of the 1953 crop; and is consideration being given by the government to granting such an advance in order to meet the costs that necessarily affect farmers during the spring period?

Right Hon. C. D. Howe (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I recall no communication from the province of Manitoba; but I shall be glad to look through my files and, if I am wrong, I will answer tomorrow.

Mr. Diefenbaker: What about the other question? Has the government given consideration to having the wheat board make an advance payment on account of the wheat delivered by western farmers of the 1953 crop in order to meet costs that will necessarily fall on farmers in the springtime?

Mr. Howe (Port Arthur): The wheat board at the moment is in the process of paying out some \$60 million, being the final payment on the crop of 1952; and it is felt that that cash in hand will be sufficient to take care of spring seeding requirements.

ATOMIC ENERGY

INQUIRY AS TO RADIOACTIVE DUST—MELFORT,
SASK.

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. A. Bryson (Humboldt-Melfort): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of National Defence or, in his absence, to the associate minister. Can the minister confirm this morning's radio dispatch reporting that radioactive dust has fallen on the town of Melfort, Saskatchewan?

Hon. R. O. Campney (Associate Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, the answer is no; I cannot confirm it.

DEVELOPMENT FOR POWER PURPOSES IN
NEW BRUNSWICK

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. H. Dickey (Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister of Defence Production): On Friday, the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Stuart) asked if the federal government had

[Mr. Knowles.]

received any representations from the provincial government of New Brunswick in connection with the development of atomic energy for power purposes in that province.

The situation is that on February 17, 1953, the Minister of Trade and Commerce referred to the government's desire that production of power from atomic energy should be discussed with those who distribute power in Canada—the provincial power commissions and privately-owned power corporations. His remarks in this connection appear at page 2011 of *Hansard*. Subsequently, a letter was received from the power commission of the province of New Brunswick, dated February 19, 1953, asking whether or not this was a general invitation for participation. The reply to this letter was sent on March 5, 1953, advising the power commission of New Brunswick that the minister's remarks could be regarded as an invitation to those interested in participation, and certain information regarding the program to date was made available. It was suggested that the power commission of New Brunswick should select an individual to visit Chalk River so that the commission would be fully informed of developments. Through this means the province of New Brunswick will be able to participate in future development to the maximum extent which circumstances will permit.

SECURITY

LOYALTY SCREENINGS—GOVERNMENT
EMPLOYEES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. E. D. Fulton (Kamloops): With reference to question No. 49, Mr. Speaker, to which the Prime Minister gave an oral answer, may I ask if he is aware of the fact that in 1950, as reported in *Hansard* for that year, information up to that time dealing with two of the agencies referred to in question No. 49 was given. If he is not aware of that fact, perhaps I can bring it to his attention. If he is aware of it, can he explain why the policy appears to be changed and that similar information on those two agencies with respect to the others should now be refused?

Right Hon. L. S. St. Laurent (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I will have to look into the matter. I did not attempt to make any comparison between what the hon. gentleman says was done in 1950 and the position now taken. I can assure him that I will look into the matter and see whether or not there is any special reason.