

Air Transport

● (1410)

[Translation]

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment quite briefly on that point or order. In my opinion, the hon. member has raised a point of order which also seems difficult to me.

There is no formal agreement between . . .

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Mr. Speaker, I listened to the hon. member a while ago; he can extend the same courtesy to me and after having heard my remarks, he may get angry if he wants to. In any event, I merely say that there is no formal agreement, but only a report drawn up by the head of the Canadian delegation in Washington. The two parties have formally agreed to keep quiet until today but that an announcement would be made in Washington and in Ottawa.

I merely wanted, with all due respect for this House, to table the report in the House before meeting the press.

[English]

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, it is so seldom this government has anything of substance to lay before the House that we think they should do it in the proper form.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baldwin: In most cases, members of the opposition extend to the government the courtesy of accepting the fact that when ministers attempt to table documents under Standing Order 41(2) they constitute documents falling squarely within the terms of the Standing Order. However, in the present circumstance, we are not prepared to do so now. I suggest that Your Honour should be entitled to examine the document and that we should be entitled to do the same. We are not prepared to accept that it is "a report or other paper dealing with a matter coming within the administrative responsibilities of the government." We do not have to accept the minister's statement. We are entitled to see the document, read it and examine it. Only under those conditions will we be prepared to give our consent.

In order to have this matter handled in the best parliamentary tradition, I plead with the minister, who made a very good speech the other day, to fall into the pattern, become a good parliamentarian and handle this matter the way a member of parliament, especially a minister, ought to handle it, by making a statement on motions and allowing members, on this side of the House to answer and deal with it. That is the way it should be done. I urge the minister to consider withdrawing the document and making a statement on motions. I am sure he will have unanimous consent to do so.

Mr. Speaker: As hon. members know, documents can be tabled in the House under the terms of Standing Order 41(2) and statements can be made under the terms of Standing Order 15(3). We have had similar incidents in the past. There is the precedent to which the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre alluded. The ruling made by the Chair at that time was that you cannot have a combi-

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

nation of both whereby a minister attempts under Standing Order 41(2) to table a statement which he might have made under Standing Order 15(3). I am inclined to make the same ruling in this instance.

It is always difficult for the Chair to make a decision in such a case without having had an opportunity to study the document that a minister attempts to table under the terms of Standing Order 41. I think the suggestion made by the hon. member for Peace River is a valid one. Perhaps we might allow the matter to stand and the Chair will look at the document. But if it is a statement which the minister might have wanted to make under the terms of Standing Order 15, I would respectfully suggest that it could not be tabled under Standing Order 41. That is the ruling which was made on a previous occasion and I would have to make the same ruling again. However, all this would be subject to the Chair being given an opportunity to look at the document.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

INCREASE IN UNEMPLOYMENT AND INFLATION—
REQUEST FOR EXPLANATION—POSSIBLE NEW MEASURES
TO COPE WITH SITUATION

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): I have a question for the Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker. Would he give the House a very brief explanation as to why Canada now faces both a soaring rate of inflation and an increase in the rate of unemployment?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Finance): The unemployment figures published this morning show a rise in the seasonally-adjusted rate. They do not in any way reflect a weakening in the economy. As I said yesterday in the speech I tried to finish, the economy has been expanding at a seasonally-adjusted rate of 9.2 per cent. I think the House is entitled to understand that the strength of the economy is reflected by the number of new jobs, August over August, 1972 464,000 new jobs, the largest increase in the history of Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: Yesterday the minister tried to read us the telephone book; I do not know whether he will read us the telephone book again today or not. Now that we have experienced "stagflation" during what are traditionally the best six months of the year, can the minister tell the House whether he has any new measures to propose in view of this increase in the unemployment rate associated with a horrendous rate of inflation?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): The hon. gentleman asked me whether there were any unusual factors that might apply. Again, I think the House is entitled to know that during the reference week of August 19, when the survey was made, there were 80,000 men and women on strike, including the rotating strikes on the railways. This