

Canadian Automotive Industry

Supply and Services (Mr. Goyer). I would therefore ask the hon. member to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Transfer for debate.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate.

COPIES OF STUDIES RELATING TO CANADIAN SHIPPING AND SHIPYARDS

Motion No. 22—Mr. Forrestall:

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of all studies, notes, position papers, memoranda, etc., relating to the requirements of Canadian shipping with respect to the proposed formula for import/export conference rated seaborne trade, in terms of the number of ships required, the capacity of Canadian shipyards, the number of Canadian merchant seamen required, the level of ancillary shipyards, the number of Canadian merchant seamen required, the level of ancillary shipyard related industries of design capability, etc., in the event Canada ratifies the proposed Code of Conduct for liner conferences.

Mr. Cliff McIsaac (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact I commented on this motion previously, I would ask the hon. member to withdraw the motion.

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Because of the importance of this matter to the Canadian shipping industry, I would like to have it transferred for debate.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate.

MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S.O. 26

[English]

LABOUR CONDITIONS

LAY-OFFS IN AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY—EFFECT ON LABOUR MARKET GENERALLY

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), to move the adjournment of the House under Standing Order 26 for the purpose of discussing a specific and important matter requiring urgent consideration, namely—

that the depression which now exists in the Canadian automotive industry directly or indirectly affects one out of every six jobs in Canada.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member gave the Chair, as required by the Standing Order, notice of his intention to put this motion. In dealing with the desirability of ordering time to be set aside for a special debate, I have regard first of all to the reasons which I gave, on January 27 of this year when the hon. member put forward a similar motion. I refer the hon. member to those reasons. I am sure he is motivated to propose similar consideration by the House of that aggravated problem by the worsening of the situation in the interval. Some of the reasons as to the reluctance to examine a specific industry in that way, in light of the obvious invitation to examine

[Mr. Foster.]

the situation in other industries which would follow, are valid and I would refer the hon. member to those reasons.

However, there is an additional factor which I think is important and which I would express to the hon. member in this way because, indeed, he raises a subject which is very grave and must be of obvious concern not only to the members of this House but to all Canadians. Subsection 5 of the rule in this regard sets out the considerations which the Chair ought to have in determining whether a special debate should be held, and one of those is the probability of the matter being brought before the House within reasonable time by other means. I felt, on January 27, that the presence of an income tax bill before the House for second reading would give hon. members an opportunity to address themselves to the economic situation in general and to the situation in the automotive industry in particular. Indeed, if my judgment needed vindication in that respect, it was amply vindicated by the meaningful address that the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent) made in this regard yesterday afternoon.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: I am not in any way being facetious in this regard; I mean that comment very seriously. I am mindful, of course, of the fact that this matter was considered yesterday but, more importantly, that the question will be considered shortly by the House. Of course, on the same bill the House will be going into committee of the whole this afternoon. This will provide the hon. member and other members of the House not only with the opportunity, in committee, under clause 1 of the bill to make their comments, but it will enable them to question the minister and some of his colleagues on this very important subject. I think that will provide a more meaningful exchange than a special debate under Standing Order 26. For these reasons, I feel it would not be proper to allow leave under Standing Order 26 at this time.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

FINANCE

REASON FOR MINISTER'S STATEMENT THAT CASH DEFICIT FORECAST WILL BE EXCEEDED

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance. The minister said in the House on Monday that the \$3 billion cash deficit for the fiscal year 1975-76 forecast in his November budget will be substantially exceeded because of reduced revenues from the export sector and higher payments for unemployment insurance. Does this mean that the minister has given up on his employment projection of 250,000 additional jobs for 1975, given at the time of his November 18 budget, or what is the explanation for the substantially higher payments for unemployment insurance in the next fiscal year?