

Agricultural Stabilization Act

The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Towers) argued that there was an omission. I would respectfully point out that this is a point of debate.

The citation makes it clear in these words:

... the royal demand of recommendation ... must be treated as laying down *once and for all* (unless withdrawn and replaced) not only ...

If there were an omission it would be the prerogative of a minister of the Crown to withdraw and replace the recommendation, and that prerogative would rest with him alone.

● (2030)

In the case of motion No. 1, it appears clear that a commodity has been added which goes beyond the terms of the recommendation, and therefore it appears to offend section 3 of citation 246 of Beauchesne's fourth edition to which I referred. I therefore rule that motion No. 1 is unacceptable from the procedural point of view.

Motion No. 2 purports to add a new factor or condition in establishing the base price of an agricultural commodity. Therefore, it does, according to the passage I cited, fall into the prohibited category.

Motion No. 3 offends perhaps one of the most fundamental provisions of the recommendation, namely, the number of years needed to establish the base price.

I therefore rule that Motions Nos. 2 and 3 are not acceptable procedurally, and cannot be put.

Does the House wish to proceed with motion No. 4, which appears to be in order?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions among House leaders and there is, I think, general agreement that, rather than proceed immediately with the bill now before the House, we should consider several other items on the order paper namely, item No. 15, coming under government business, dealing with the travel of the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development, then items S-25, S-17 and S-15. If we complete that business before ten o'clock, we would propose to revert to consideration of Bill C-50. I hope that there will be consent for this proposal.

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to accept this proposal. We are always willing to accommodate the government. We look forward to anything which will improve our desperate economic situation. I do not know what the Explosives Act will do to the economy, but we are willing to discuss it.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, we also agree to this re-arrangement of our business. At least we will not get any less done this way.

Mr. Baldwin: Stanley, you are a cynic.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Penner): Is it agreed that we proceed as suggested by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp)?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[The Acting Speaker (Mr. Penner).]

INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT**AUTHORITY FOR STANDING COMMITTEE TO TRAVEL**

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council) moved:

That the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development be empowered to adjourn from place to place in Quebec and Ontario on two separate occasions on June 8 to 10, 1975, and on June 15 to 17, 1975, or during the summer adjournment of the House, to study economic development on reserves and to inspect some historic sites and parks, and that the necessary supporting staff do accompany the committee.

Motion agreed to.

* * *

PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES (INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS) ACT**PROVISIONS OF PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES TO EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES' OFFICIALS IN CANADA**

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs) moved that Bill S-25, to amend the Privileges and Immunities (International Organizations) Act, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a few comments about this short bill. Although it is relatively small in size, in terms of the number of clauses it contains it is an important bill.

As hon. members will have noted, the European communities will open a mission in Ottawa in the fall of 1975 and the purpose of this bill, which seeks to amend the Privileges and Immunities (International Organizations) Act, is to accord the mission legal capacities and immunities and to provide that the representatives of the communities shall be accorded privileges and immunities normally accorded to diplomatic envoys under international law.

I wish to underline the importance which Canada attaches to the forthcoming opening in Ottawa of this mission of the European communities. As hon. members know, an important thrust of Canadian foreign policy at present is to establish a contractual link with the European communities. As the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) mentioned in the House of Commons yesterday, I believe, the European commission is now seeking authorization from the Council of Ministers to commence negotiations with Canada for the development of a general framework agreement between the communities and Canada. That, of course, is an important development, and it is our expectation and belief that the Council of Ministers will authorize the commission to undertake these negotiations, which we hope will result in the establishment of that link. Obviously, because of the importance which we attach to this development in our relations with Europe, we consider the opening of a mission of the communities in Ottawa as a significant step. We welcome that development.

The purpose of this bill therefore is to grant to the mission and its representatives the privileges and immunities which are normally accorded to diplomatic envoys under international law, and this is to be achieved by a