pared to other special areas and this is what those objecting to the amendment will accomplish. It will be one way of saying to the Cape Breton people: You will not be dealt with like other people in special areas of Canada. In fact, I do not think that anyone would feel it advisable to create such a situation.

[*English*]

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. My question of privilege arises out of the fact that the minister has distorted a number of facts and has accused me of so doing. I would first call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that there is no pension plan for retired miners in Cape Breton, something which the minister implied on a number of occasions. He referred to this wonderful pension set-up among Cape Breton miners.

Mr. Deachman: Is this your point of privilege?

Mr. MacInnis: You wouldn't recognize it if you saw it.

Mr. Deachman: Tell the Speaker your point of privilege.

Mr. MacInnis: There is Leady Deach, who can do nothing better than make recommendations around the House which violate the principles of committees. You are the last one who should open his mouth.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order. The hon. member should address his remarks to the Chair. I would remind the hon. member, and other hon. members of the House, that Standing Order 37 provides as follows:

> No member may speak twice to a question except in explanation of a material part of his speech which may have been misquoted or misunderstood, but then he is not to introduce any new matter, and no debate shall be allowed upon such explanation.

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, that would give me a lot of leeway, because all my remarks have been completely misunderstood. To begin with, on the question of pensions which has been entirely misunderstood—and you have just ruled that I can only get up and explain those things which were misunderstood—I say again to the minister that there is no pension for those Cape Breton miners who were pre-retired, forcibly retired, or whatever way you wish to look at it. This is his mistake; he continually refers to it as a pension. I do not even allow the Devco authorities to use the word. It is not a pension; it is a pre-retirement leave plan.

• (9:00 p.m.)

The minister also referred to a meeting in his office when the executive officers of the UMW said, "Never mind that fellow; he does not represent us". True, I do not represent the UMW, but I represent each and every person in Cape Breton, whether they be UMW members or not. As long as I have the responsibility to represent them, the minister and those hired in the Crown company who have been selling the big lie in Cape Breton are not going to get away with it.

With respect to the meeting in the minister's office,—and this only requires a yes or no answer—was the minister not informed by union members—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order, please. The hon. member raised a question of privilege; now he is asking a question.

An hon. Member: It is a question of privilege.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): The hon. member raised a question of privilege, and there is no privilege. I read the hon. member the Standing Order which states that no member may speak twice to a motion.

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. My point of order is that it is impossible for me, when Your Honour is on your feet, to say anything. The only time I am permitted to speak is when Your Honour has resumed his seat.

An hon. Member: Stand.

Mr. MacInnis: Yes, I can stand. But, Mr. Speaker, you have already ruled that no member shall speak twice on the same subject unless it is to explain his remarks which have been misunderstood. I repeat, on the same question of privilege, that the minister made accusations about a certain meeting which took place in his office and which I attended. He also made reference to the fact that 78 or 65 per cent, or whatever percentage he used, of the men accepted this pre-retirement leave plan voluntarily. The question to the minister is this: Was it not at that same—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. MacInnis: Was it not at that same meeting—