

Privilege—Mr. Broadbent

unclear point from the procedural point of view, and that I thought a reply should be given, which it was. I said that there was no procedural basis upon which I could recognize any other member without opening a debate.

I think that is probably the safest course to take, notwithstanding the desire of several members, including the Prime Minister and the hon. member for Halifax, to get into the debate; and I think that upon that procedural basis I should take the safe course and close it off.

MR. BROADBENT—ANSWER GIVEN BY MINISTER OF STATE FOR URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I rise on an entirely different question of privilege. Earlier in the question period, the Minister of State for Urban Affairs (Mr. Ouellet), either deliberately or inadvertently—and I am assuming the latter until he clarifies the record—told the House that under the changes announced in the housing program those who are going to get a subsidy for mortgages in the co-op housing section would get a mortgage of 1 per cent for 35 years. The clear, commonsense interpretation of that answer is that anyone who is in a co-op housing project would get that 1 per cent mortgage for 35 years.

As the minister surely knows, the reality is that such is not the case. According to a document which was circulated by his own department in the month of May, the reality is that someone in a co-op housing project might get a subsidy down to the 1 per cent level and might get it extended year after year for up to 35 years. Because of other changes made in the regulations by his department, it is most unlikely that anything approaching a significant number of people going to that co-op project, would be eligible for a 1 per cent mortgage and subsidy, on the assumption that a significant number in that project were eligible for a 1 per cent mortgage subsidy.

That is a very important point because the minister, in his remarks today, left the impression that there is a fundamental change in policy which will be to the advantage of the co-ops rather than, as many of them see it, to their disadvantage.

I should like him to clarify the record on that point and make it clear that it is just possible that a few people might get a subsidy down to the 1 per cent level. In that context, would he clarify the other concern which is directly related?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent) is raising what is essentially a point of disagreement or interpretation. However, in case there has been, as we have recognized in the past, the possibility of a misleading reference, the minister may contribute now, but I do not think it should go much further.

Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of State for Urban Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I think I should say very briefly that perhaps I should send to the hon. member and to other members of the House some background information on the proposal which will clearly indicate its intent and its advantages, as the policy has been amended. This should meet some of the remarks

[Mr. Speaker.]

which have been made by the co-op groups and non-profit groups.

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

MR. WHITEWAY—ALLEGED MISLEADING OF HOUSE BY PRIME MINISTER

Mr. Dean Whitley (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order regarding a statement made by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). I think the Minister of State for Urban Affairs (Mr. Ouellet) might want to correct a misleading statement made by the Prime Minister in answer to a question from the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark), in which the Prime Minister indicated that the new housing initiatives have been taken by the Minister of State for Urban Affairs with the agreement of the provinces.

The Minister of State for Urban Affairs then rose in his place and, in answer to a later question, indicated that the province of Manitoba had not given agreement. The telegram which he quoted clearly states that the province of Manitoba wishes to reach agreement at the earliest opportunity. That is a clear indication that the minister proceeded with the housing program without the consent or agreement of the province. The Prime Minister, deliberately or inadvertently, misled the House by saying, in answer to an earlier question, that the new initiatives have taken place with the agreement of the province.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Surely the hon. member raises a matter of disagreement, not a matter of order.

MR. STEVENS—CLARIFICATION REGARDING TABLING OF WAYS AND MEANS MOTION

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, my point of order touches on the order of business for today and certainly for tomorrow. As you know, sir, we had difficulty with the original tax motion with respect to a portion of Bill C-56, and your ruling called for the tabling of a new tax motion, a new ways and means motion, which would facilitate whatever the government saw fit to do with respect to clause 30 of Bill C-56.

● (1532)

The reason for my point of order was perhaps to receive clarification from the Minister of Finance (Mr. Chrétien) as to whether he intends to table notice of his ways and means motion today, so that it might be concurred in tomorrow on the assumption that we will move into committee of the whole stage tomorrow, at which point we may well reach clause 30.

[Translation]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Finance): On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, in the ruling you made in this House, you indicated that it was not necessary to table a notice of an