

to pension arrangements laid down in the legislation of 1967, and he will tell you, "We are now negotiating". They are now in negotiation with respect to pensions covering the employees and their dependants under section 18 (1) (a) and (b). There is no doubt that the legislation has not been conformed with, despite the claims Mr. Blackmore made before the committee. He was then in charge of the Cape Breton Development Corporation, coal division.

I referred to the remark made by the minister regarding the situation in the mining towns of Cape Breton today, numbering in excess of 1,700 men, all of them at an age which would make them acceptable to industry in accordance with government standards. They are now walking the streets, and in many cases they are forcibly retired. I refer to the situation in the town of Glace Bay, where the mine was closed in defiance of the legislation which asked them to rehabilitate and reorganize the mines; and also to statements made before the committee when Devco officials told us that no pit would be closed until alternative work could be provided. The legislation refers to alternative work being outside the coal industry. Yet last Friday Devco announced the closure of the mine in the town of Glace Bay.

What is the situation? The legislation was passed in which it is quite clearly spelled out that Devco was to broaden the base of the island's economy. I buy that—but I also insist that the economy of Cape Breton Island can just as well be broadened from the towns of Glace Bay, New Waterford, Dominion and Sydney Mines as it can be from any other place on the island. I have always maintained that the energy of Devco should be extended in the direction of the town of Glace Bay and other towns on Cape Breton so that they could obtain the protection referred to by the minister who represents Cape Breton Island when he said on June 15, 1967, at page 1579:—and in the meantime build up alternative industries so that there will be a cushioning effect on displacement and so that the total economy and the total community will be protected.

This is what I referred to as the intent of the legislation, because when the legislation is going through the House and has been studied clause by clause and questions come from the opposition or even from the government side of the House, whether or not a particular clause is passed depends on the answer provided by the minister at the time.

The miners in the community were promised by the minister at that time that their total community would be protected. All that Devco has so far accomplished in the mining towns of Cape Breton is to remove from these towns millions of dollars. The social obligation which was recognized at the time the legislation was passed by the House has been completely ignored. I am hopeful that under the direction of Mr. Kent, many of the evils left behind by Mr. Blackmore and Mr. Ord will be corrected. The fact remains that it will be a long, hard tow because of the fact that good legislation has been completely ignored.

I appeal to members of the House to take my plea into consideration. I can ask for nothing on behalf of the Cape Breton miners and their communities than that which was promised in the legislation. All I ask for is that which was granted by way of legislation and passed in the House. Support such as was given by the Justice and Legal

Speech from the Throne

Affairs Committee would require all hon. members of the House to stand behind something that this House has put in writing as a promise to these people and their communities.

I am not asking for \$6 million for these 1,700 miners. If you are going to compare hard-luck stories and produce \$6 million for an American company, surely you can back up your own words and the words of the minister. We, as Members of Parliament on all sides of the House should appeal to this government to deliver to these miners what they were promised in 1967 by way of legislation. I am not asking for anything more and I would not be satisfied with anything less. Surely on the opposite side of the House there must be somebody who can take up my cause in the Liberal caucus tomorrow, before the cabinet, and plead it on behalf of the Cape Breton miners.

• (1730)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but I must do so to advise him that his time has expired.

Some hon. Members: Carry on.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I hear hon. members suggesting that the hon. member should continue. Of course, I am in the hands of the House in this regard. However, I wish to indicate that this evening will finish the Throne Speech debate, and there are many members who wish to speak. I repeat that I am in the hands of hon. members. Does the hon. member have consent to continue?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, since I am making an appeal as strongly as possible I will not infringe on the good will of the House. I spoke of the pension arrangements provided by funds allocated to the coal industry. I might mention that Mr. Ord said that UIC funds were being used because they were public moneys. This has been denied by the minister in charge of the UIC fund. He has clearly stated to this House that the UIC fund belongs to those who contribute to it. In this respect Mr. Ord was wrong; Mr. Blackmore lied about UIC. I have documentary evidence to that effect.

With respect to the protection of the communities referred to by the minister from Cape Breton Island, I would refer to the minister responsible at the time the legislation was put through who, when asked about the situation with respect to any mining town that may have suffered because of a mine closure and thus had lost tax revenue, said:

This is exactly why we are providing millions of dollars to help develop the industrial basis of these towns.

I am sure that on reflection members of the government and its supporters would wish to see, with respect to legislation passed by this House, that it would deliver to the miners that which is theirs, including the return of their UIC benefits, the setting up of protection for present employees and their dependants and for former employees and their dependants, something which is not evident today despite what was laid down and promised by legislation in 1967. Again, I thank members of the House for their indulgence.