

*Oral Questions*

the appearance of conflict with an eye to bringing in guidelines which are fairer to spouses as soon as we can.

**Mrs. Sauvé:** Mr. Speaker, I would express the opinion that Mrs. Crosbie is not free, but she has had to be subservient or bow to the interests of her husband and to rules which do not make any sense in this century but which were brought down by the Prime Minister.

To continue his reasoning, would the Prime Minister then say that a person who is employed, for instance, as a nurse in a hospital could not keep that job if her husband, or his wife, happened to be a cabinet minister?

**Mr. Clark:** Of course not, Mr. Speaker. Of course the rule would not apply in that way.

**Mrs. Sauvé:** Why not?

**Mr. Clark:** The problem has to do with holdings which might be felt to influence public policy, and I should simply say to the hon. member that if she knew Mrs. Crosbie as well as I know Mrs. Crosbie—

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**An hon. Member:** Shame.

**Mr. Dawson:** Details?

**Mrs. Bégin:** Explain.

**Mr. Clark:** I rather regret that in this age, if I may quote the hon. member, a comment of that kind should excite this kind of reaction from hon. members on the other side of the House of Commons.

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

**Mr. Dawson:** It is the people behind you who are laughing.

**An hon. Member:** Your own members.

**Mr. Clark:** Mrs. Crosbie is a very strong individual in her own right. She is respected by me, by my government and by members of the House who know her in that capacity. She has raised an important public question. By the manner of her raising it she has caused us to review a difficult and delicate conflict of interest guideline.

**Mr. Breau:** She showed you that you are stupid.

**Mr. Clark:** By the manner in which she acted independently to bring herself into accordance with the guidelines, she has kept alive the necessity to review those guidelines and has yet allowed the government and her husband to adhere to a standard of freedom from conflict of interest which is probably without precedent in the country.

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

[Mr. Clark.]

**PRIVILEGE**

MR. RODRIGUEZ—ALLEGED MISLEADING ANSWER BY PRIME MINISTER DURING QUESTION PERIOD

**Mr. Speaker:** I have a notice of privilege from the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez).

**Mr. John Rodriguez (Nickel Belt):** Mr. Speaker, my question of privilege arises from an "answer"—and I put that in quotation marks—which the Prime Minister (Mr. Clark) attempted to give to me this afternoon in the House to a question I asked. I think the answer he gave was misleading to this House. I think it may be misleading because of the fact that he does not understand the manner in which federal programs such as DREE interface with provincial programs and corporations which apply for these grants under the federal program.

My concern this afternoon dealt with the actions of the Michelin Tires Company in relation to the Nova Scotia government and the legislation which was introduced into that provincial house regarding the manner of organizing workers in the Michelin plant. The concept which was introduced there was one of the interdependent plant. It runs contrary to article 87 of the ILO of which Canada as a nation is a signatory. In response, Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. member will have to move quickly to indicate the nature of the question of privilege. If it is simply to take issue with the answer or to grieve about the extent to which his question was answered, obviously, as he knows from previous days and several rulings, I cannot be permitted to extend that to him without doing the same for every member every day.

**Mr. Rodriguez:** Thank you for that comment, Mr. Speaker, and I will get quickly to the point.

I realize that that is a provincial legislature, and I asked the Prime Minister, in view of the fact that DREE is a federal agency and that it has entered in the past into agreements with the Michelin Tires Company with respect to DREE grants, accelerated depreciation, duty-free importation of tires—and, in fact, the new plant is coming before the federal government for the same sorts of agreements—whether he could use that leverage as means of getting the legislation withdrawn or to get the company to impress upon the provincial government that it does not want the government interfering with the legitimate right of the workers to organize.

I put that question to the Prime Minister. He replied that he cannot interfere in what is obviously a relationship between a provincial government and corporations or individuals in the province of Nova Scotia. I am not asking him to interfere with the provincial government and its relationship with its citizens. I am asking him on behalf of Canadians to indicate by reason of that leverage that we as Canadians are not prepared to see a step back into the past, 1948, with respect to labour legislation in Canada.