

*Economic Forecast for Current Year*

is on the issue of whether or not the government is correct in resisting the production of the document. Now, anything that is relevant to that issue would, in my opinion, be relevant to the debate. At this moment, I do not believe we have gone beyond the scope of the debate.

**Mr. Pickersgill:** Thank you, sir. This document which was published on January 20, 1958, was an economic forecast for the year 1957. It was a confidential document prepared by civil servants for the use of ministers and never intended to be published. It was prepared for the previous government. The Prime Minister saw fit, after he became the leader of the house, to make that document public.

Now, the government was greatly embarrassed by the fact the opposition—

**Mr. Pallett:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order; the parliamentary secretary on a point of order.

**Mr. Pallett:** I should like, Mr. Speaker, to refer to your own words uttered during this session and recorded at page 682 of *Hansard* during the debate on the first motion for the production of documents under the new rule. At that time Your Honour said, and I quote:

Before the hon. member proceeds further with that line of argument I think I should say to him that my view of the scope of the motion is that it is limited to the desirability of the production of the documents. The motion is one calling on the government to produce the documents referred to in the motion. The question in issue is whether or not they should be produced. Production of them has been objected to.

**Mr. Robichaud:** Is this a new type of closure?

**Mr. Martin (Essex East):** That does not help very much.

**Mr. Pallett:** The hon. member for Gloucester seems to feel that the interpretation of the rules should be for one side of the house only. I assume that is what he thinks, from his interjection; but I am one of those who believe the rules should apply to all members of the house and that the orderly conduct of business requires the observance of them by every member of the house. I am raising this point of order in the proper way in which it should be raised, and if the hon. member wishes to argue the point he will have that opportunity.

**Mr. Speaker:** May I ask the hon. member for his assistance in respect of his point of order? If the issue is, as indicated, whether or not it is desirable that this document be produced, whether it is confidential or in the public interest or any other proper ground

[Mr. Speaker.]

upon which objection is taken, would it not be relevant to the debate to indicate what use had been made of this document or similar documents in the past or what disposition had been made by this government and former governments of the document in the past? Would this not be relevant to the issue of what should be done at this time? That is the difficulty. As I say, the argument of the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate is directed towards showing that this document now called for is the same as an earlier document under another name, and to show that certain use was made of that document, that certain publication of that document was made by the government, and that therefore the objection that it is in the public interest to withhold the document now falls to the ground on the basis of that precedent. If the hon. member for Peel feels that is out of order, I would be glad to consider the point.

**Mr. Pallett:** In so far as the matter of relevancy is concerned, the document that was referred to as the Canadian Economic Outlook has always been produced the year after it was prepared. There was never any objection to that being produced.

**Mr. Martin (Essex East):** Never.

**Mr. Pallett:** The hon. member for Essex East says "never".

**Mr. Martin (Essex East):** That is right.

**Mr. Pallett:** He is like that never, never bird.

**Mr. Pickersgill:** I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. My question of privilege is that the hon. gentleman, under the guise of a point of order, is seeking to debate the very question I was seeking to debate when he interrupted me. If he wishes to debate it, he should take his turn.

**Mr. Speaker:** Well, I think I cannot give effect to the objection. It seems to me the debate had better proceed along the lines on which it started.

**Mr. Pickersgill:** Thank you, sir. As I say, this document was published by the Prime Minister on January 29, 1958 under circumstances that were rather dramatic. A couple of years later the government saw fit, and I can only assume it was because of their embarrassment in the matter, to discontinue this forecast. I will not go into that because I think it would be irrelevant. They introduced a new series of documents which were described at some length by the distinguished Minister of Trade and Commerce in *Hansard* at the page to which I referred. I put that reference in so that the document would be identified. It is quite clear that although the