

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, I wondered whether on October 20, three days ago, when the word "lie" was used in the House, a few of the rules and customs of the House went through the window. I thought that the rules and procedures of this House applied to all backbenchers as well as to prime ministers and members of the cabinet. I draw Your Honour's attention to page 392 of *Hansard* for October 20. The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) is reported to have used the following phrase: "or is he just interested in telling lies to the House?" He was replying to the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker). He then went on to say, "Is it a lie or not?". Strangely enough, in that case, sir, no one was in a position to know whether or not a lie was involved.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The point made by the hon. member is very well taken. I assure him that I am in full agreement with him. No matter whether such language is used by senior members of the House or by less senior members such as the hon. member, it still is not correct. I certainly would not condone the use of such words by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) or by the most senior or the most junior member.

May I say that if the hon. member had been in the Chair at that time he would have heard quite a bit of noise. Certainly, the exchange which took place between the two right hon. gentlemen was not audible to the Chair. It was picked up by the *Hansard* reporters; they obviously have better ears than the Speaker. That is how those unfortunate words got on the record. I noticed them the next day and felt badly about them. I certainly would not want the use of such words, even by the Prime Minister, to set a precedent.

The hon. member is quite right to bring his point forward. We cannot allow even right hon. members of the House to use words that are prohibited in the language of other hon. members. I tell the hon. member that I am sorry I was not on my feet at the time, to mention or bring home a point of order to the right hon. gentleman in the sense that I am now doing in the case of the hon. member for Cape Breton-East Richmond (Mr. MacInnis). Again I must apologize for interrupting him. I am sure his speech is much more interesting than mine.

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, in the language of the House of Commons, the statement made in the press with regard to the blanket approval on the part of the President of the Privy Council to the approach to be used by Liberals seeking office in Nova Scotia was far removed from the truth.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. May I commend the hon. member for his choice of language.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacInnis: The matter I am talking about touches on the responsibilities of the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand), the Minister of Labour

The Address—Mr. MacInnis

(Mr. Mackasey) and all members of this House. During the past two years I have been fighting on behalf of the miners who were retired before retirement age by the Cape Breton Development Corporation which is a Crown company. Certain officers there enjoying executive positions, expensive cars and expense accounts, have been given the protection of the civil service, while others more deserving of that protection are without it.

There are men there who ought to be given the protection that has been extended to certain Englishmen who have come over here and taken our jobs. The men who are employed by the Crown corporation are entitled to the same protection afforded by the Civil Service Act as has been extended to Englishmen who have come over here and bumped out of their jobs men in the coal industry in Cape Breton who are more qualified than them. I say without fear of contradiction that the men who were brought in, replaced men who are far superior in the coal mining industry. They were brought over to this country and given these jobs. They were extended the protection of the civil service. That protection ought to have been extended to other employees of this Crown corporation.

While I am on the subject of mining in Cape Breton, I appeal to the government, as I have appealed to it in the past, to take a good look at the legislation that was passed to set up the Cape Breton Development Corporation. The minister at times has been a little annoyed at remarks I have made. I say that Messrs. Ord and Blackmore have misinformed the minister on a number of occasions and told him things that do not accord with the facts. I ask all members of this House, including the Minister of Labour, the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion and the minister who represents Cape Breton in this House, to examine the involvement of UIC funds in the subsidization of the pre-retirement plan of the Cape Breton miners. We should look at that legislation. As I do not have a copy of the legislation here, I will paraphrase it. Section 18 specifically states that the funds to be used to pay the men on pre-retirement are to be from the coal division fund. That is spelled out in black and white in the legislation. The Cape Breton Development Corporation has nothing to do with the UIC fund. Although they have absolutely no administrative responsibility, they are using the money the miners have paid into the fund, some for as long as 45 years.

● (4:10 p.m.)

When Mr. Blackmore arrived from England he walked into a cushy job. He is the man who set this up. Nowhere in the legislation passed by this House has Devco been given authority to touch UIC funds. Many men receive their UIC cheque every second week and Devco makes up the balance to \$2,500 or \$3,000. It is not possible for a man in his first year of retirement to receive more than \$300 or \$400 from Devco, yet the legislation states that the least he shall receive is \$2,500, with a maximum of \$3,000. That is an abuse of the privilege of the members of this House who voted in support of that legislation.