

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, December 13, 1971

The House met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

NOTICE OF TIME ALLOCATION MOTION FOR THIRD READING STAGE OF INCOME TAX BILL

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I wish to state that it has not been possible for the representatives of the several parties in the House to reach an agreement under Standing Order 75A, nor has it been possible under Standing Order 75B, with regard to an allocation of time to the third reading stage of Bill C-259, an Act to amend the Income Tax Act and to make certain provisions and alterations in the statute law related to or consequential upon the amendments to that act.

I am therefore giving notice of my intention to propose at the next sitting of the House a motion under Standing Order 75C that debate at the third reading stage of the bill conclude on Friday, which will provide an additional three days after tomorrow.

Mr. Baldwin: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Your Honour, of course, held on this point of order the last time this unfortunate action was announced that you are bound by the statement of the minister and we cannot go behind it. That is a precedent and of course we accept it. However, because of what I said before I think I am entitled to state on a point of order that, while I knew of the discussions which were being held as to the question of time allocation, I did not participate in them. Without the safeguards provided by the proposed amendment of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield), which view was unfortunately not shared by other parties, it was the position of this party that we could not agree to a limitation within the time mentioned by the minister.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

STATEMENT BY MINISTER ON NORTH ATLANTIC COUNCIL MEETING AND CONVERSATIONS WITH EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COMMISSION AND CERTAIN FOREIGN MINISTERS

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, in the course of three days in Brussels last week I attended the December ministerial meeting of the North Atlantic Council, continued our conversations with the European Economic Commission and had

meetings with the French Foreign Minister, Mr. Schumann, and the Acting Foreign Minister of Greece, Mr. Palamas.

Western Europe, with Britain on the threshold of the community and already being drawn into its councils, is the scene of some of the most dynamic developments in the world today. The negotiations for the enlargement and deepening of the community in their final stage are paralleled by East-West negotiations over the status of Berlin, and by promising moves toward a *modus vivendi* between the Federal German Republic and the German Democratic Republic. These developments, taken together, are bringing about a Europe more soundly based economically and with a healthier and saner political climate.

Progress on Berlin is the most dramatic of these developments. Since the Second World War, Berlin has been a focus of the East-West confrontation and unsettled relations between the Federal and Democratic Republics of Germany a major stumbling-block in the search for détente.

Without the active support of NATO, Chancellor Brandt would have been unable to negotiate, on a basis of equality, the treaties with the U.S.S.R. and Poland, nor could the Federal Republic, acting alone, have any real hope of reaching a *modus vivendi* with the German Democratic Republic.

It is against this background of forward movement in Central Europe that the NATO meeting should be seen. The two major preoccupations of the alliance, and I believe of the Soviet Union and the countries of the Warsaw Pact, are the holding of a conference on security and co-operation in Europe and the negotiation of mutual and balanced force reductions, usually referred to by the acronym MBFR.

• (2:10 p.m.)

On the conference, ministers reaffirmed the position they adopted at the June meeting, that NATO countries are ready to enter upon multilateral preparations for a conference when a satisfactory conclusion of the Berlin talks has been reached. Meanwhile, they agreed to keep in touch with the Finnish government which has offered Helsinki as a site for conversations on this subject. Two of the stages needed for a Berlin settlement have been concluded. The Soviet Union has made conclusion of the final stage contingent upon ratification of the Warsaw and Moscow treaties. This may be expected within the next few months.

What is important, however, is the process set in motion by the conference concept. The conference, whenever it is held, and whatever its outcome, is only one element of a wider negotiating process. The substantial gains I have noted in Central Europe have their foundation in the realistic "Ostpolitik" of Chancellor Brandt. But I wonder whether they would have been achieved had the confer-