

The Address—Mr. MacInnis

stupid. He also said that it is unreasonable, and that no action is being taken.

An hon. Member: That is not what he said.

Mr. MacInnis: I thought somebody would pick me up on that. I would ask the hon. member to refer to the remarks in *Hansard*, because these words will appear in *Hansard* unless the hon. member goes up and fools around with the "blues", as quite often is done. The hon. member also referred to federal responsibility. It is very regrettable that we have had so much lack of action on the part of the government.

It is further regrettable that the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand) interfered with the civic election in Montreal. I am not concerned about it one way or the other, but it would seem to me that he has attacked his own party and that his resignation has been called for because of the statement he made about the election in Montreal. I could not care less who is elected in Montreal. No matter who is elected there, Canadians will be faced with another big bill from that city. That city has had write-offs before and we must be prepared again to write off the expense of the Olympics which are to be held there. I recall the statement made earlier that there would be no cost to the Canadian taxpayer. Anyone who would believe this is experiencing a pipe-dream. The Minister of Regional Economic Expansion has been criticized for the statement he made. He has been asked to withdraw the statement and resign his seat because of it.

I should now like to speak about the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen), who at the eleventh hour of the election in Nova Scotia appeared before an audience in Cape Breton and told the people what cannot be classed as other than a lie. The proof that this minister lied can be found in the bill which was placed before this House by the government, Bill C-5, dealing with the situation in respect of Deuterium of Canada Limited, in Cape Breton. The minister gave blanket approval. The Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson) questioned the status of the provincial government in Nova Scotia, because he could not have been talking about Prince Edward Island.

● (4:00 p.m.)

According to the President of the Privy Council, everything is sunshine. He gave blanket approval for Liberal candidates in the Nova Scotia election to say—I have the tapes to prove this—that if elected they would improve the situation with regard to old age security. That is fine. The President of the Privy Council went before a Cape Breton audience and gave his blanket approval to this. That was done on behalf of Liberal candidates because the minister wished to hide from the people what little confidence those candidates had in their federal cabinet member. Almost everybody in this House has made representations to the government to increase old age security, yet the President of the Privy Council said, "If

[Mr. MacInnis.]

you elect the Liberals in Nova Scotia we will take care of old age security."

An hon. Member: Shame!

Mr. MacInnis: The President of the Privy Council gave his blanket approval to this.

Mr. Pepin: Let us hear the tapes.

An hon. Member: Which party was elected?

Mr. Pepin: Let us hear the tapes.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. MacInnis: If the minister wants to hear the tapes, I will provide them to him later. In the meantime I suggest that he will obtain his answer most quickly if he asks his colleague, the President of the Privy Council, to come into this House and deny that he lied to the people of Cape Breton.

An hon. Member: Shame!

Mr. MacInnis: The tapes will back me up. Further proof that the minister was wrong in his actions is contained in Bill C-5. In addition to promising to look after the matter of old age security, if elected to the legislature in Halifax, these people made claims with respect to the Nova Scotia government and the coal division of Devco. That was another lie—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps the hon. member would allow me to intervene at this moment. There must be some reason, I suggest, for the approach taken in speeches made in the House of Commons. I think certain words are most unbecoming. The hon. member will have a chance to speak in a moment; the Chair also has rights in this House.

I suggest to the hon. member that it is against the long-established practice of the House of Commons to ascribe lies to another hon. member. There are other ways of conveying the impression that one thinks the facts have not been stated correctly by another hon. member. I realize, of course, that there is a different aspect in this situation in that the hon. member referred to events which did not take place in the House. The hon. member is referring to the participation of another hon. member in a provincial election and says that the statements made during that election were untrue or did not accord with reality.

Whether the hon. member is correct or not—and he may very well be correct—I suggest to him that the language used is not in accordance with the customs, traditions and usages of the House of Commons. I am sure the hon. member would wish to keep that in the back of his mind as he proceeds with his remarks. I apologize for interrupting him. He has every right to say what he thinks in this House.