

*The Address—Mr. Nielsen*

Much was said by the leader of the NDP, in his remarks on the throne speech, about the urgency of dealing with old age pensions. Again, judging from the number of questions on this subject placed on the order paper by the party to my left, and the number of times it has been raised by members of the Cr ditiste party, one would think this would be an urgent problem, one with which this government should deal immediately.

We have heard many suggestions regarding amendments that are required in order to improve the unemployment insurance legislation. Indeed, the NDP issued a table of priorities before this parliament convened and in that list of seven priorities they stipulated these to be matters deserving immediate attention. Quoting from an article which appeared in the current press, they wanted action to minimize the effects of winter unemployment, a close watch on the operations of the Unemployment Insurance Commission to prevent inefficiency and delay in issuing cheques, an immediate ban on job elimination, tax cuts for the ordinary citizen, and so on.

Our leader has suggested that this debate should be adjourned today or tomorrow and that the government should bring forward immediately legislation which has been prepared and which will increase old age pensions and deal equitably with old age pensioners. If the NDP does not accept that position, if they do not concur in that suggestion, it means that they are not acting in the best interests of those for whom they purported to act during the election campaign. It is the most shallow hypocrisy for the leader of that party to go carousing across the country expressing his great concern for our old people, advocating increases in the old age pension, and then to stand up in the House and say that his party will not support the suggestion that we deal with it immediately because they want to carry on a debate on the throne speech, which will delay immediate action for the old age pensioners.

The same argument applies to the unemployment insurance changes that are necessary. For members of the Cr ditiste party and members of the NDP, who went through two months of campaigning stating all the ills that must be cured in these fields, not to support the suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) to deal with these matters immediately is not only hypocritical but it is a betrayal of their duty to their party supporters and to the so-called principles that they purport to support.

They said, in a decision that was made long before the throne speech, that they were going to wait and see what legislation came forward. They said that immediately after the throne speech they would hold a press conference, which they did. At that press conference they said exactly that which they had already determined they would say, that is, that they would wait and see the legislation. They said they would keep this government in power until such time as they saw whether their legislation merited support, but they would oppose anything the government brought forward that did not agree with the list of priorities that they had presented.

What a phony position to take! They will support the government in power, without seeing the amendments to the old age pension legislation; they will support the government in power, without seeing the amendments to the

[Mr. Nielsen.]

unemployment insurance legislation; they will support the government in power, without any idea of how they will create new jobs; they will support the government in power, on the strength of a vague promise by the government to set up a committee to study the high cost of food and the increased cost of living.

**Mr. Alexander:** It's a love affair.

**Mr. Nielsen:** They love them; they are in bed with them. It is what one of my colleagues called, during the speech of the leader of the NDP, a marriage between consenting adults: that is precisely what it is. That is the most shallow of hypocrisies, the most shallow position for any party purporting to espouse any principles at all to be taking. If these matters are so urgent as the members of the NDP have been wanting us to believe they are, why do we not deal with them tomorrow? Why should not the government bring forward their UIC legislation, their legislation to deal with increases in old age pensions, and let us adjourn this debate and deal with those matters tomorrow?

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Nielsen:** I accuse the leader of the NDP and his followers, if they are going to say the same things that he said, of fear. They will not go along with the suggestion of the leader of our party because they do not want the information before they vote. They do not care about having the information before they vote, because they will vote for the government regardless.

When the leader of the NDP says that the leader of this party has nothing in his record as premier of the province of Nova Scotia to merit his confidence, I do not wonder at all why his party has not held a seat in that province since the defeat of Mr. Gillis in 1957. The leader of the NDP just does not understand the Atlantic provinces. He does not realize that the expertise of the leader of this party resides in the creation of jobs and in economic policy. If there was one thing that the leader of this party did in the province of Nova Scotia, it was to reform the economic fabric of the province and create jobs.

• (2130)

**An hon. Member:** Tell us some more.

**Mr. Nielsen:** If the hon. member wants to interject, let him not do it cowardly, from his seat; let him ask for the floor and I will gladly give it to him. I do not mind reciting the fact that I lived in the province of Nova Scotia for six years while I studied; I am very proud of that. I understand that province, and maritimers generally. I am just sorry that more members opposite and to my left did not have the same opportunity.

I need only cite the accomplishments in Nova Scotia of the leader of this party in the creation of Industrial Estates Limited, which created and maintained 5,000 jobs in that province. Not a single aspect of that plan has been changed by the present Liberal premier of the province. The leader of this party revised the system of education there and restructured the economic environment of the province into the form which has been continued to this day by a Liberal premier.