

Business of the House

groups in the country with respect to their concerns about the results of the security conference. Of course, a principal concern has been the possibility that boundaries which came into effect after the Second World War would somehow be rendered immutable or sanctioned in some way by this conference.

● (1540)

That objective has not been attained by those who sought it. The text indicates quite clearly that these boundaries are not immutable and that they are subject to peaceful change under the rules of international law. I have been able to assure my correspondents that their concerns will be met in the texts which will be proposed at the summit meeting. I understand the concerns, and they have been met very fully. The efforts have been resisted.

Because of the words uttered by the right hon. gentleman, I think it is worth saying that in the field of human contacts and the desire that there be a free movement of ideas and peoples as a basis of future détente, this concept has been recognized in the texts, so that in the future they can be used as a basis for further development in the movement of ideas and the movement of peoples. This is a further objective which has been sought by the groups to which the right hon. gentleman has referred.

Mr. Baldwin: All you need now is an umbrella.

Mr. Danson: Mr. Speaker, for the record I think it is worth pointing out to the right hon. gentleman from Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) that there was, indeed, some parliamentary debate on this subject when his seat-mate, the hon. member for Malpeque (Mr. MacLean), the late, lamented member for Scarborough West, and myself were members of a delegation to the Interparliamentary Union specifically on this conference in Helsinki. I think it was in January or February of 1973. It was a unique occasion, when parliamentarians did have an opportunity to report on such a conference and issues involved, and to debate them at that time. So it was the subject of debate.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez) seeks the floor on a question of privilege. He will be heard just after questions on the order paper.

* * *

[Translation]

MISCELLANEOUS PRIVATE BILLS AND STANDING ORDERS

Fifth report of Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills and Standing Orders, in both official languages.—Mr. Loiselle (Saint-Henri).

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

[Mr. MacEachen.]

[English]

PARLIAMENTARY SEMESTERS ACT

MEASURE TO DIVIDE CALENDAR YEAR INTO THREE
PARLIAMENTARY SEMESTERS

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-411, to divide the calendar year into three parliamentary semesters.

Some hon. Members: Explain.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to provide for three fixed semesters of parliament in each calendar year, so that members of the House of Commons will know when parliament will be sitting and thus can better organize their time to perform the related duties of members of parliament, particularly with respect to their constituencies. It is also designed to put a heavy onus on the government to organize the work of the House so that adequate time can be given for debate and to ensure that end of session game playing with important legislation will cease.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. John M. Reid (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: 2,277, 2,330, 2,429, 2,436, 2,521, 2,765, 2,766, 2,778, 2,783, 2,819, 2,847, 2,851, 2,939 and 2,941.

Mr. Speaker, if question No. 716 could be made an order for return, this return would be tabled immediately.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

[Text]

NATIONAL HARBOURS BOARD—PORT OF MONTREAL

Question No. 2,277—**Mr. Forrestall:**

1. Did the President of the Privy Council approve the decision made by the National Harbours Board as stated in the answer to Question No. 1,899 that Board Minutes respecting the delegation of some authority regarding day-to-day operations of the Port of Montreal to an Executive Committee is an "internal and not a public document" and, if so, on what date?

2. Will the President of the Privy Council consider giving an opinion as to whether or not the National Harbours Board decision complies with the guidelines announced in 1973 by the government respecting the release of documents to Parliament?

3. Have any extracts, excerpts, quotations, portions, citations, passages or any other selection of Board Minutes of either the National Harbours Board or the National Capital Commission been made public