

## TRADE

PROPOSED INTERNATIONAL COMMODITY AGREEMENTS—  
GOVERNMENT POSITION

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, may I direct my question either to the Prime Minister or to the Minister of Finance about the brief report we received from Iran when the Minister of Finance was there? I would not wish to suggest to the Minister of Finance that there has been any wrong reporting. According to press reports, he suggested in Iran that all raw materials moving in international commerce should be subject to international agreements, both from the point of view of buying and selling countries. I ask, is that the policy of the government of Canada? Is it the view of the government of Canada that wheat, copper and other commodities besides oil should be subject to international agreements? If so, is the government of Canada taking an active initiative to push that view in the world community?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, the government's position, generally speaking, is that we are in favour of international commodity agreements. Actually, we are members, I believe, of every international commodity agreement which exists. But we have always insisted that these agreements are only fair and workable if they represent the producer and the consumer. We have been invited on several occasions to join agreements on commodities which were merely producer agreements and we have until now hesitated to do so, for reasons I just indicated. We could, I suppose, in special cases consider other actions. But this is our general policy, and, in so far as the minister explained that, he was certainly explaining what has been government policy for some time.

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[Translation]

## FISHERIES AND FORESTRY

Second report of Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry—Mr. Béchard.

[Editor's note: For text of above report see today's Votes and Proceedings.]

● (1200)

[English]

**Mr. Stevens:** Mr. Speaker, I have given notice of a question of privilege which I should like to raise on Tuesday next with respect to Canadair Limited and vote L20 in the estimates of the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce calling for the spending of \$38.1 million to purchase that company. It is a company which, upon purchase by the federal government, will apparently have no worth and one which has incurred cumulative operating losses of \$2.4 million in six years, in spite of having received \$21.5 million in grants and \$21 million in financ-

## Privilege—Mr. Stevens

ing benefits from the federal government. If it is in order, Mr. Speaker, and with your consent, I should like to present my question of privilege more fully on Tuesday.

**Mr. Speaker:** I have never taken a position which would discourage the practice which the hon. member proposes to follow, that is, to give notice and thus afford other hon. members an opportunity to prepare themselves to participate in discussion. I think, however, that the hon. member ought to put forward at least a description of the nature of his question of privilege. He has mentioned the subject, but its nature has not been elucidated. I think it is in order to let the matter go until Tuesday next in order to allow other hon. members to contribute, but I wonder whether he will now indicate the nature of the question of privilege. We can hear argument on Tuesday.

**Mr. Stevens:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. I did not want to delay unduly the regular order of business of the House. The question of privilege centres on what took place in the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs yesterday. A vote was called for on vote L20, at which time the Committee quorum was lost as a result of certain members on the government side vacating the room. Thus, the regular order of the committee's business could not be proceeded with. In consequence, I believe there will not be an opportunity properly to vote on and review this estimate, and on Tuesday I intend to seek your guidance as to what would be the correct approach for members of the House to take with respect to this unfortunate development.

**Miss MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands):** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. It arises from a reply to a question of mine by the Minister of State for Urban Affairs (Mr. Danson) earlier this morning concerning a meeting on May 21 to which I had referred. Since I would not wish the minister, perhaps unintentionally, to leave a wrong impression with the House, I thought he might wish to confirm, or otherwise, that a message did go out from his office today to the effect that the meeting had been postponed indefinitely.

**Mr. Danson:** Yes, indeed. A message did go out from my office this morning to the effect that the May 21 date was not a convenient one and that I would be in touch shortly suggesting further dates which might be suitable.

## CONSUMER PACKAGING AND LABELLING ACT

MEASURE TO ENSURE PUBLIC CLEARLY UNDERSTANDS PRICE  
OF PRODUCTS FOR SALE

**Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo-Cambridge)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-390, to amend the Consumer Packaging and Labelling Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to ensure that the public is able to clearly understand and see the price on the products they buy and to prevent the price being removed on items that come under the universal product code marking. The bill represents the concern of members of the Kitchener-Waterloo area branch of the Consumers Association of Canada that the removal of