

*Inquiries of the Ministry*

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. It is difficult to know the circumstances of the situation to which the hon. member refers. I should think that if the question is in order it should be placed on the Order Paper, and I would have some reservations about that too.

[Later:]

**Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question related to one asked a few moments ago by the hon. member for Edmonton Centre, and I direct it to the Prime Minister. Were any public funds involved in the production of the film shown on "The Nation's Business" last night and supposedly sponsored by the Liberal party?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. The hon. member has reiterated the question asked by the hon. member for Edmonton Centre. My suggestion was that due to the fact that it related to certain circumstances it might be placed on the Order Paper and if there was urgency it could be considered at the time of adjournment.

**Mr. MacInnis:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the difference between the questions asked is that I related my question to a program supposedly sponsored by the Liberal party and the use of public funds. I think the Prime Minister should be in a position to answer whether or not this is so.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member will recognize it has been suggested that if there is urgency in respect of the hon. member's question or the question of the hon. member for Edmonton Centre the matter might be considered at the time of adjournment.

**EXTERNAL AFFAIRS****PROPOSED RECOGNITION OF COMMUNIST CHINA**

**Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Has he any additional information for the House on the negotiations in respect of the recognition by Canada of the Peking government and when are those negotiations likely to be concluded?

**Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, I have nothing fresh to add to the information I have already given the House. Our negotiations continue. I cannot say when they will be successfully concluded. I hope they will be but, as I have said on many occasions, in dealing with the Chinese one must be very patient.

[Mr. Paprowski.]

**Mr. Baldwin:** And the same in dealing with the Canadian government; you have to be patient.

**UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE****INQUIRY AS TO WHITE PAPER**

**Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour. Can he inform the House when the proposed white paper on the Unemployment Insurance Commission will be forthcoming?

**Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour):** I cannot say specifically, Mr. Speaker. It depends on a lot of factors. It depends on the workload of the House, the workload of the government and the workload of the departmental committees. We indicated in the Throne Speech there would be such a paper and I hope it will be forthcoming.

**Mr. Broadbent:** Mr. Speaker, can the minister inform the House whether it is currently being held up because of objections by the Department of Manpower?

**Mr. Mackasey:** The answer to that is no.

**DENIAL OF BENEFITS TO CERTAIN EMPLOYEES IN B.C. INDUSTRIES INVOLVED IN DISPUTES**

**Mr. Mark Rose (Fraser Valley West):** I have a question for the Minister of Labour which is similar to the question directed to the Minister of National Health and Welfare by the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway. It relates to those people not directly involved in labour disputes in Vancouver such as harbours board employees and building trades and Pacific Press employees specifically who have been denied unemployment insurance on the ground that there is a labour dispute and are not able to get social welfare because they are not regarded as unemployed. What does the minister plan to do now about this particular situation?

**Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour):** Mr. Speaker, the policy of the Unemployment Insurance Commission in respect of strikes has been very clear and consistent throughout the years. Even though a person may not belong to a union, but want to take advantage of a legal strike, he is not entitled to unemployment insurance because he becomes eventual beneficiary of the union's negotiations.

**Mr. Rose:** I have a further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The problem seems to centre around the fact that they are not—