

The deliberations of the commission, and then of the drafting committee, were certainly fruitful, as the hon. member for York North has suggested, but they were not always carried on in full agreement. One could sense that all the delegates at the same time wished very much to reach consensus and were willing to sacrifice some of their original positions in order to reach that consensus. For the information of the House I would like to read that part of the Final Act referring to the third commission, that is, the commission on economic affairs, which relates particularly to the input of the Canadian delegation. The recommendation reads as follows:

• (1750)

[Translation]

The Conference, recommends that participating delegations encourage their government:

- to co-ordinate and promote co-operation with underdeveloped countries in order to extend national and international plans for development aid and to devote to the growth of those countries their financial advantages and savings made thanks to co-operation and European security
- to work in order to alter existing tariff systems to the extent that their effects on underdeveloped countries are hindering the acknowledged purposes of the aid and co-operation and especially to take steps to stabilize the price of raw materials at a profitable level.

[English]

I remember particularly that in the debates relating to that last point which has to do with the stabilization of the world prices of raw materials and of basic commodities, there was a particularly heated exchange at one moment over what certain European countries had done to the economies of certain parts of the underdeveloped world in such cases, for example, as the overproduction and dumping into the international market of sugar from sugar beets. I was reminded in this House the other day that we, too, in Canada are embarking on a program to encourage the growing of sugar beets. If we are to be serious in attending these conferences, taking part in them and coming to a consensus on general resolutions, we should also bring back with us the sense and import of these resolutions, particularly as they would apply to our policies.

As the hon. member for York North has suggested, our going to Europe to join in these conferences can become a bit of a hollow exercise if we simply go to take part in a conference, in the shaping of the resolutions and in agreeing to the consensus that is struck, and then return home and forget about our participation there and the arguments which we as parliamentarians made.

I will end on this note, Mr. Speaker. Of course, none of the commitments made by the delegation from this parliament is binding on the government. But I think it is important for parliament to hear the report, to consider it and the position taken by the delegation in coming to what was, after all, on several very important matters a rather critical and important consensus. I would like to thank hon. members for hearing this report. As has been pointed out, this is a precedent. I hope it is a significant and important one. I was proud and honoured to be a

Inter-Parliamentary Union

member of the delegation; and although Helsinki may be a dark place in January, I would be glad to return there almost any time—not in the next two weeks but certainly in the very near future.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. We are encountering one or two problems. As the hon. member who just had the floor mentioned, this is a new procedure, and I think we should try to proceed in an orderly manner.

It has been suggested that the amendment proposed by the hon. member for York North (Mr. Danson) cannot be moved by him since he is the seconder of the motion. Even if the amendment were moved by somebody else, the Chair, looking at it and seeing it refers to the Final Act of the conference, which is not before the House at this time, could well determine that it is introducing a foreign matter, a new proposal. Further, the proposition to refer the subject matter of the conference to the committee is also a new proposal, foreign to the original motion which merely invites the House to take note of the conference.

The Chair suggests to hon. members that possibly the best procedure would be to obtain the unanimous consent of the House to allow the hon. member for Fundy-Royal (Mr. Fairweather) to withdraw his motion; then we could discharge the order that is presently before the House. Again, by unanimous consent, as an order of the House the subject matter could be referred to the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence. Would this procedure be agreeable?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Is it agreed that the House give unanimous consent to the hon. member for Fundy-Royal to withdraw the motion before the House?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Is it also agreed that we discharge order No. 76 from the order paper?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Is it also agreed, by unanimous consent, that the subject matter included in the motion be referred to the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Order discharged, motion withdrawn, and the subject matter thereof referred to the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Six o'clock.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): I hear the suggestion that we call it six o'clock. Is this agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): It being six o'clock, I do now leave the chair until eight o'clock p.m.

At six o'clock the House took recess.