

May I ask the hon. member for Digby-Annapolis-Kings whether he thinks the Minister of National Health and Welfare is able to do anything for 20 million people when he cannot do anything for 6,000.

**Mr. MacEachen:** Mr. Speaker, I just want to speak for a moment on a question of personal privilege. It is a fact that I, in company with the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys (Mr. Pepin) had intended to be in Halifax and Sydney today to undertake discussions with the provincial government and representatives of the coal industry on the union and management side. In view of the parliamentary situation and my responsibility as a member of the government, I decided to postpone the trip but not to cancel it. I called the Premier of Nova Scotia last night at 11.30, who understood the situation perfectly and agreed with me that we would have a meeting at a later date.

**Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South):** Mr. Speaker, on the question of personal privilege which has been raised by the minister, am I to understand from his remarks that the minister was to meet with the interested parties today, including the provincial government in Nova Scotia, the U.M.W. and the Dominion Coal Company?

**Mr. MacEachen:** That is so.

**Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South):** In reply to that question of privilege, I raise one myself. I spoke with the interested parties concerned yesterday, including the president of the U.M.W., who informed me by phone that he had not been invited to this particular conference in Halifax today, a matter which was confirmed by the provincial minister of mines for Nova Scotia. So now the minister has lied to the house.

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

**Mr. Speaker:** Order; the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. MacInnis) knows that he cannot say that another hon. member has lied to the house; that is elementary. There are many rules which are being disregarded in this house today, and just as many rules were disregarded yesterday, but we must draw the line somewhere. I cannot, and hon. members would not want me to, allow an hon. member to say of another hon. member that he has lied to the house. I would ask the hon. member to withdraw.

23033-164

*Administration of Justice*

**Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South):** Mr. Speaker, I will quite unequivocally and willingly withdraw my remark that the minister lied to the house, but I would substitute the statement that he has certainly misled it.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order; the hon. member cannot say of another hon. member that he has misled the house. He can say that the remarks made by the hon. member are perhaps incorrect. Well, perhaps I could correct myself. He cannot say that an hon. member has wilfully misled the house.

**Mr. Nielsen:** The hon. member did not say that.

**Mr. Speaker:** Very well, I will accept that.

**Mr. Nowlan:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Because of the remarks made by the hon. member for Cape Breton South, who is quite concerned with this problem as are all hon. members from Nova Scotia, I hope that the Minister of National Health and Welfare will not forget the question I posed but will be able to answer it. Members of the backbenches spoke with him last night because they are somewhat disillusioned with parliament, and that might be the feeling of backbenchers on both sides.

I can understand that the Minister of Justice wanted to resign because some of the backbenchers in the house are fed up with parliament, but can he educate us by telling us what would be wrong in the minister or in the Prime Minister standing up in the house and naming one or two names?

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Raymond Langlois (Mégantic):** Mr. Speaker, after listening for a day and a half to the debate about Miss Munsinger, I notice that as the discussion wears on, more and more things are stirred up. It has been just found out that Miss Munsinger is alive and today we read in the papers that even the Attorneys General are beginning to stir things up in their respective provinces, adding a little spice.

Here, the more I hear the more I think that holding a full and complete inquiry into this case, as suggested, might contribute more to the security of the country than could have been expected at the beginning. And, in that connection, I am basing myself on an article published on Thursday, March 10, 1966, in a Montreal newspaper. It deals with remarks made by the Quebec Attorney General, or