

taxpayers of Canada indirectly spent some \$20 million recently renovating that hotel. Can the government House leader say if there was a violation of the agreement between Canadian National and Hilton hotels with regard to the closure of the hotel? That is the first question. Second, have inquiries been made to determine if the Canadian National system participated in any recent decision of Hilton hotels to close that particular hotel? I appreciate that the government House leader may have some difficulty answering, and that is why my preamble was so long. He now knows all about it and perhaps can answer now.

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I have no idea why I should be asked to deal with this question, unless I have a responsibility hitherto undisclosed to me.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: You look like a bell boy and one always asks the bell boy.

* * *

MANPOWER

LABOUR DISPUTE AT HOTEL VANCOUVER—REASON FOR CONTINUING TO SUPPLY WORKERS

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, I directed my question to the government House leader because both the Minister of Labour and the acting minister have decided to absent themselves from the House. May I direct my supplementary question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration? Notwithstanding that particular dispute in Vancouver, the Department of Manpower has continued to supply workers to the Vancouver Hotel, which is a clear way to assist management in that particular dispute. Would the minister advise whether it is the policy of this government and of the Department of Manpower to supply scabs in industrial disputes to assist one side and not the other?

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): The Department of Manpower maintains a neutral position. When an employer indicates that he needs employees during a strike, we indicate to the individual before he is referred that that particular plant has been struck, and if he chooses not to go to work there unemployment insurance benefits are not cut off. If there were a lockout, is the hon. member suggesting that we would be fair if we said to the individual that we could not place him until the lockout is over? We must be as neutral as we can, and that is what we endeavour to do in these disputes.

* * *

[Translation]

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION POSSIBILITY OF PURCHASING STATION CJBR-TV RIMOUSKI— MINISTER'S POSITION

Mr. Eudore Allard (Rimouski): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Secretary of State.

Oral Questions

In answer to a question I asked in the House on June 21 about the CBC purchasing CJBR station in Rimouski, the minister insinuated that some hon. members were opposed to it. After consultation with all these hon. members, except for one representing a riding in the eastern part of the province—

An hon. Member: Who?

Mr. Allard: I have no right to name him but the hon. member knows very well who he is. Could the minister tell the House what prevents him from giving justice to this part of the population in eastern Quebec and northern New Brunswick where this service is overdue?

Hon. John Roberts (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, as I already explained on several occasions to the House, this is a matter which is being actively considered. Of course, advice from hon. members should be considered. There is the question of the credits which would be required considering the fiscal restrictions which are in effect now. I assure the hon. member that we consider this matter carefully and I hope to be soon in a position to answer his question.

Mr. Allard: Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask a supplementary.

Will the minister take into consideration the representations made by the Chamber of Commerce and all people from eastern Quebec, when a single member opposes this transaction?

Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, I try to keep in mind the representations made by all members, but unfortunately, they are not all coherent. Some may want some kind of action, others may want another kind of action. So I try to consider all opinions expressed, but it is impossible to agree with everybody on that issue.

* * *

[English]

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES AUTO PACT—GOVERNMENT POSITION ON FINDINGS OF TASK FORCE CANADA NOT GETTING FAIR SHARE OF BENEFITS

Mr. Bill Kempling (Halton-Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. Having regard to the federal government's review of the north American automotive industry, does the minister agree with and support the findings of the automotive task force that Canada is not obtaining its fair share of benefits from the auto pact between Canada and the United States?

[Translation]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I said on several occasions that the auto pact had been very successful for Canada. We now have a much greater proportion of production in Canada than was the case before. There is still an imbalance between our production and our imports, but I agree that we shall take the necessary