

prepared to meet with him at any time and explain anything he wants to know in relation to the multiculturalism policy because if he is that far behind I believe I should spend a lot of time with him explaining what is going on in my department.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

WEEKLY STATEMENT—WITHDRAWAL OF BILL C-6 FROM STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): May I ask the government House leader the usual question as to forthcoming business? I do not know whether he is in a position today to designate opposition days, but if he is not perhaps he could do that a little later. Could he tell us, though, what the government business is for today and subsequent days?

Mr. MacEachen: We shall continue today with the third reading of the bill on metric conversion. After that, certainly beginning tomorrow at the latest, we shall call Bill C-6 having to do with diplomatic immunities. Depending on the outcome of a proposal I shall make to the House in a few moments, we shall then go on with Bill C-3 in relation to Deposit Insurance, Bill C-36 on motor vehicle safety which, I understand, we can deal with through at least the second reading and committee stages, and Bill C-40, the aeronautics bill, which I understand we can also deal with in all stages at least up to third reading, tomorrow.

As hon. members are aware, Bill C-6 is presently before the standing committee. If I am given consent I should like to make a motion to withdraw the bill from the committee so that it can be referred to committee of the whole and dealt with here tomorrow, hopefully through third reading.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): On behalf of the Official Opposition, I consent.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): There are some comments I wish to make later but I rise to indicate our agreement with the proposal regarding Bill C-6.

Mr. MacEachen: May I, then, move:

That Bill C-6, an act respecting diplomatic and consular privileges and immunities in Canada be withdrawn from the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence and be referred to the committee of the whole.

Mr. Speaker: The motion can only be put by unanimous consent. Is there consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: The House has heard the motion proposed by the President of the Privy Council. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Business of the House

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): With regard to the business announced for today and tomorrow, there is a comment I should like to make. I have no objection to the bills he has called but I object very strenuously to his continuing refusal to call Bill C-30 which has to do with the Holidays Act. Some weeks ago the minister gave us a list of the bills he wanted passed before the end of the session. By implication, this left a number of bills which were not considered important. Bill C-30 was on the "wanted" list. In the last few days we have dealt with a number of bills which were on the "unimportant" list, while the government refuses to call Bill C-30. I suggest that instead of scraping the barrel the hon. gentleman should bring forward Bill C-30 and let us see whether we can do something about the proposals it contains.

Mr. MacEachen: I believe the division of bills into categories of wanted and unwanted is quite unwarranted. I have not refused to call Bill C-30. I have explained to the hon. member that the moment has not yet arrived. The occasion is not right to call that bill. It may occur later in the session.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): One question to clarify a statement made earlier by the minister. Is it his intention to call Bill C-6, that is the diplomatic privileges bill, as the first item of government business tomorrow in any event?

Mr. MacEachen: Yes, Mr. Speaker, except that if we conclude the debate on the metric conversion bill we would have to consider what business from the list I have given we would call later in the day. Otherwise, that list will be in place tomorrow beginning with the diplomatic privileges measure.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I should like to make a comment on one other point. The House leader for the Official Opposition made reference to the opposition days which remain. Perhaps by tomorrow we can reach an understanding as to which day might be designated next week for us. We would like it to be Thursday, June 16. I understand there is some objection to that day because it would mean the loss of the private members' hour. Discussions are taking place as to whether that private members' hour might be shifted or whether something else might be done along those lines. But I hope it can be Thursday, June 16, without the loss of the private members' hour. Obviously the designation cannot be made today but at least the House now knows what is in store.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, I understood yesterday there was agreement in the House that after the minister made his statement on the North-South Conference there would be an opportunity for a limited time to direct questions to the Minister. I was wondering whether this would be an appropriate time at which to proceed along those lines.

Mr. Speaker: If the House were to agree perhaps we could go ahead with the questions customarily allowed at the end of a ministerial statement. We might do that on orders of the day. Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.