

check it against sections 18(a)(i) and 18(a)(ii), and so on. Then they might ask, did we intend that the high-salaried principals would receive the protection that others have been denied?

The hon. members might go on and look at the different approaches taken by Devco and the former chairman of that board who is now running the National Capital Commission, much to the regret of many people in this area, I am sure. They might check out what the vice-president in charge of development had to say, and then turn to the evidence given before the committee, which indicates that they were entirely wrong in their statements before the committee.

Again I say there have been blatant lies, impositions and coercion. A man is made to subsidize his retirement by the use of his UIC benefits. He is also forced to subsidize his final retirement by using his Canada Pension Plan benefits. I might say that in addition to that, if a man finds employment with somebody else and makes a contribution to another employer, Devco in the end reduces his final retirement benefit. Despite the fact that some of these men paid both their own share and the employer's share of unemployment insurance, nevertheless Devco uses it to subsidize the retirement benefit.

The Minister of Justice (Mr. Lang) is here, and I would ask him to take a good look at the evidence placed before the committee. I appeal to him to see that the legislation passed in this House is fully supported by the House of Commons.

Mr. Lang: I read the court evidence, too.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond): You should read section 18, which makes it mandatory for Devco to see that the pension scheme protects its employees and dependants. In other words, while the judge says there will be no benefit paid to widows or dependants, section 18(a)(i) of the act provides:

pension arrangements for the benefit of persons, and dependants of persons, employed by the Corporation—

Section 18(a)(ii) reads:

pension arrangements for the benefits of persons, and dependants of persons, formerly employed by the companies—

Today we have a situation where the judge comes down with a decision and says that no pensions will be paid. If the pensioner dies, the pension dies with him. Devco is getting ready for a big stunt; it is going to set up a pension scheme of \$400 a year for a man who has worked 20 years. Then let us see what they intend to do for a dependant widow and other dependants of a miner. They may be protected for a five-year period, or if he lives over a year into his pension years they can look forward to a pension from the corporation for one year after the death of the husband.

I might also mention that I have documented evidence to the effect that in its own policy statements Devco has said that it will pay a widow for the month of the pensioner's death until the last day of the following month, but not thereafter. That is in contravention of section 18(a)(ii) of the act. I have another quotation here from Devco. It reads:

—make a single payment to her on the last day of the month in
25714—15

The Address—Mr. D. MacInnis

which the pensioner dies and again on the last day of the month following but not thereafter—

I submit that that is an absolute contradiction of section 18(a)(ii) of the act. Again I appeal to the members of this House and point out to them that the legislation passed by this highest court of the land is not being fulfilled. The judge said that none of these men would be recalled. That is not the fact. So far as the judge's finding is concerned, he expressed it in dollars and cents and not in accordance with right or wrong. He referred to the cost and also to the benefits to be paid. He referred to them as being substantial.

I ask anyone in this House if he would consider \$75 a month after 50 years service substantial. Why did the judge refer to the dollar and cents aspect? We went into court on the recommendation of the committee, looking for a right and wrong finding. We did not ask for an opinion in respect of dollars and cents, but this is what we got. We want justice. We ask that there be a further examination of the legislation passed in this House, because if there is such an examination no one could come to any conclusion other than that these men are not protected under the civil service superannuation plan in the same way as members of Devco.

• (2120)

If there is any question about this, I can read a letter made available by the former minister who I am sorry to see has left the department because we were just about reaching a conclusion on this; I think he was sympathetically considering the matter and was reaching the understanding that he had for some years been listening to lies from Mr. Blackmore. I think he was prepared to do something about the matter, and this letter would indicate that the former minister of the Department of Regional Economic Expansion was prepared to do something. The new minister has also shown a sympathetic approach and has indicated to me he hopes something can be done to straighten things out.

Now where did the minister stand? I have a letter here addressed to Mr. D. V. McDuffe, assistant, Canadian legislative representative, United Transportation Union. It reads as follows:

Dear Mr. McDuffe:

Replying to your letter of February 1, 1971, I wish to advise that employees of the Devco Railway who were formerly in engine and train service of the Cumberland Railway Company Limited could be included in the public service superannuation plan but at the present time are not because the corporation has not applied to have employees in these categories (and in like categories) included in the plan.

This is the letter from the former minister of that department indicating that the employees of the Cape Breton Development Corporation can get the protection of the civil service superannuation plan if the Devco officials will look for it. They have not made any effort whatsoever to provide this protection for the men. But they have provided for themselves, and for four years they have been enjoying that protection.

An hon. Member: Shame!

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond): The legislation, and again I refer to section 28(e), is only a blanket