

progress in developing an auto manufacturing industry outside of central Canada, particularly in British Columbia?

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, I do not know whether that particular representation has been made. But I do know that the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce has a concern with the auto pact agreement. He has done a fantastic job so far, and we are looking for improvement in the future.

Mr. Leggatt: Mr. Speaker, that is not a very clear answer. My supplementary question is this: it has been reported that the U.S. embassy has made direct representations to the Government of Canada not to make proposals for duty remissions to foreign companies, so the impact is that the U.S. will receive new foreign assembly plants, rather than Canada. Has the United States embassy, or any other U.S. agency, made representations to Canada not to provide duty remissions to Datsun, Volkswagen or any other foreign company?

Mr. Cullen: Mr. Speaker, I will bring the hon. member's representation to the attention of my colleague, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce.

* * *

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

BENEFIT ENTITLEMENT OF EMPLOYEES LAID OFF BY DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL REVENUE

Mr. Bill Clarke (Vancouver Quadra): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Employment and Immigration. Since the Department of National Revenue taxation branch has commenced its annual mass hiring of 3,000 keying operators and clerical workers, and since most of these workers come from the ranks of those who are not in the work force, not employed and not on benefits, could the minister say if it is his intention or expectation that these workers, when they are discharged by the Department of National Revenue, will be eligible for benefits from his department?

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Employment and Immigration): I would expect that if they were under personal contract, no, Mr. Speaker. But if they were hired by the department, of course they would pay their premiums and would be entitled to the benefits if they were unemployed following their period of employment.

Mr. Clarke: Mr. Speaker, how does the minister see the proposed changes in Bill C-14 as affecting these temporary workers?

Mr. Cullen: Mr. Speaker, that is a hypothetical question. Until we get the bill through this House and the other place, it is not really appropriate for me to comment, because I do not know what the bill will be in its final form.

Privilege—Mr. Crombie

● (1502)

PRIVILEGE

MR. CROMBIE—STATEMENT BY MINISTER OF STATE FOR URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. David Crombie (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege with regard to statements made by the Minister of State for Urban Affairs (Mr. Ouellet) in connection with my position on the policy of mortgage interest and property tax deductibility. I wish to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to thank you for being permitted to clarify it. I have supported, and do support, that policy. I support it for four reasons which I commend to the minister. First, it is a policy—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have given the hon. member the floor. I understand the nature of his question of privilege. The Minister of State for Urban Affairs (Mr. Ouellet) described the position of the hon. member for Rosedale (Mr. Crombie) to the House. If he has been inaccurate in describing that position, the hon. member for Rosedale has the opportunity to say so, which he has just done. However, I do not think even he would expect to have the opportunity to give us all of the reasons why he has taken the position that he has taken.

Mr. Crombie: My intention was, simply because the minister had deliberately misrepresented my position, to have the opportunity—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some hon. Members: Withdraw!

Mr. Crombie: I know the minister understood well he was misrepresenting my position on the matter. My concern, therefore, is to instruct the minister on my true feelings so that he might better represent them when he goes elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker: Order. We are getting into a little danger here about which I think I ought to warn the parties. The House recognizes at once that the minister having earlier indicated the position of a member of the House with regard to a particular policy, the member has the opportunity at the earliest possible moment to rise by way of a question of privilege to correct the minister on that. It is not fortuitous to indicate that that misrepresentation, if it was such, was a deliberate misrepresentation by the minister. However, I think that the hon. member may be understood in this effort to say that the minister knows and, if he did not know, the hon. member wants this opportunity to correct him. I think in that spirit that remark can be accepted. However, both sides will recognize there is a limit to how far we can go. I want the hon. member for Rosedale to have ample opportunity now to indicate that he disagrees with the interpretation by the minister. Presumably the minister will respond. Then perhaps we can close it off.

Mr. Crombie: Mr. Speaker, I apologize if I used the word "deliberately" when I should not have done so. There are four very good reasons why all hon. members of this House would