

are the ones that will benefit from this because the tax is removed from exports. It improves the ability of new mines to be opened. It will ensure that old mines which might be closed are kept open a little bit longer to allow for them to continue employing people in her own backyard.

\* \* \*

### UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT

**Mr. John R. Rodriguez (Nickel Belt):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. I think it is safe to say that the people, particularly the unemployed in Atlantic Canada, are not interested in the spitting match between this place and the Senate. They are not interested in the lover's quarrel between the Conservatives in the government and the Liberals in the Senate. What they are really interested in is being able to collect their unemployment insurance benefits under the variable entrance requirements.

The unemployed in the Atlantic are not statistics. They cannot be played with in politics. They are human beings, flesh and blood and bones.

Why are you using the Liberals to play politics on the backs of working class people who are unemployed? Why do you not extend the variable entrance requirements now?

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Barbara McDougall (Minister of Employment and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, if there are any lovers in this House, it is between the two parties on the other side.

Let me just say that in terms of the workers of Canada, the workers of Canada deserve better than an old-fashioned unemployment insurance bill which does not help them prepare for the future. What they deserve is training money. What they deserve is the repeal of the repeater's provision. What they deserve are sickness benefits, along with maternity provisions, all that and the variable entrance requirements. The variable entrance requirements in our bill are much more sensitive to the workers in his region than is this bill. I will wait for my bill, thank you.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

### Oral Questions

• (1510)

### POINT OF ORDER

#### COMMENTS DURING QUESTION PERIOD

**Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister, President of the Privy Council and Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, I simply wanted to respond to a point of order that was raised by the member for Lambton—Middlesex, as reported at page 7060 of *Hansard* for December 18. He was asking Your Honour to make a decision about withdrawing a remark that I made when I indicated that he was misleading when he suggested that the projected drop in farm income was the deliberate result of government policy. I indicated that that was not the case. I used the word "misleading". I did not use the words "intentionally misleading", which I know is unparliamentary.

He also indicated that the government was responsible for the drop in the price of grain since we came into office. I indicated to him at that time that we were concerned about the drop in incomes in 1990, that we had a process in place to review some of the existing policies, that we were monitoring the situation, and that if there was need for interim assistance as the situation unfolded we would be prepared, as we were in previous years, to look at the situation.

The government has no control over the price of commodities established in the international marketplace nor do we have any significant control over rainfall. Under these conditions we always monitor the situation and respond. I would simply say, in response to your indication that you wanted assurance that implicit in my answer was not the intention to accuse the member of deliberately misleading, that that was not the intention. I used the word "mislead". I think it is parliamentary. I did not use the words "intentionally misleading", therefore I do not believe it would be appropriate to have the word withdrawn.

**Mr. Speaker:** I thank the hon. minister. I shall consider it and report back to the House if appropriate.