

*Correspondence on Surcharges**(Translation):*

Mr. Gilles Gregoire (Lapointe): May I ask all my hon. friends, to whom we were kind all day long by allowing them to pass special motions and bills without any filibustering, to give us their unanimous consent. And here, we shall see whether they are kind or not. I appeal to their kindness.

Mr. Speaker: Do we have unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Gregoire: The Leader of the Opposition did not say no.

Mr. Speaker: I sincerely regret, but some hon. members expressed their opposition.

(Text):

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that Your Honour was misunderstood. I am sure there is unanimous consent.

Mr. Speaker: That may be so in so far as the hon. member is concerned but I think if he had either rear-vision mirrors or sound detectors towards the rear he would have heard nays from behind him.

Mr. Bell (Saint John-Albert): Mr. Speaker, I am sure there would be unanimous consent, if you wished to call for unanimous consent again.

Mr. Gregoire: Mr. Speaker, may I—

(Translation):

Mr. Speaker: Do we have unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Gregoire: I wish to thank all the hon. members of this house for the kindness they have just shown me.

Mr. Speaker, if I may say so, one must ask for a lot if one wants to obtain much. And I wish to ask for a little more. Would it be possible to obtain the unanimous consent of the house to give priority to the bill in the name of the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette), to amend the Canadian National Railway Act (salary of president).

Mr. Speaker: No.

Mr. Gregoire: Mr. Speaker, the last time I talked to this motion, I asked that all documents be tabled, at that time, I asked that all documents related to the crisis of June 24 last be tabled. I got the answer that there were too many of them.

There was even a newspaperman from *Le Soleil* who told me it would make a huge pile of paper. Now, I obtained those documents that we may add to those requested

[Mr. Bell (Saint John-Albert).]

today and that we could enter under the category of those I have here, and that have been printed in *Hansard* today.

In my opinion, if the hon. members want to consult them, they will notice that the year's deficit in our balance of payments comes to exactly the same amount as the money paid out of this country, or \$770 million, paid in interest on foreign investments.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to come back to the bill, I feel that the documents requested here should include a certain one which was before the privy council. According to information I have, it would have come before the council in 1947. We would like to see it included with the one we are interested in.

It was mentioned in 1947, 15 years ago, that if the government of Canada did not take proper care, we would experience a serious economic depression.

Mr. Speaker: I must point out to the hon. member that he is straying from the point like he did the first time.

This motion calls for the tabling of certain papers; it does not deal with an amendment nor is it a speech or a debate.

Could the hon. member address himself to the motion to which he is restricted. It states the nature the date and period of the document. An hon. member cannot ask for the tabling of a document going back to 1947 or, for that purpose, to Noah.

I would therefore ask the hon. member to limit his remarks to the motion.

Mr. Gregoire: The document I am interested in is a copy of any letter or paper which may have been exchanged between the Prime Minister—no mention is made of the year; it may be 1947—and an official of the Department of Finance. That document would be the prelude of all those which brought about the crisis of June 24, 1962.

The documents being asked for today have to do with the legality of the tariff surcharges which were preceded by a document announcing that those surcharges were forthcoming. That document would involve correspondence between the Prime Minister and a Department of Finance official.

That document, according to my source of information, would have mentioned that, if the government did not change its policy, exactly what is happening today was going to happen and that, in 1965, even more serious causes would appear which would result in our making concessions in our trade with the United States.