

it was passed a year and a half ago? Would he clearly explain what he means by that?

Mr. Nielsen: The minister was at committee meetings and he heard me propound that theory when I participated in the debate on second reading. I would invite him to review the debates in order to find my answer. I made that statement and I stand by it. I may be wrong, but that is my conviction.

An hon. Member: You are wrong.

Mr. Nielsen: Of course, my friends to the left would say I am wrong because they have to be the big Wally for the government. They have to keep it in office and keep it clean, so they naturally are going to say I am wrong. As a matter of fact, I see the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) paying acute attention to my remarks. The efforts of the hon. member for Verdun to destroy the position of this party are only exceeded by the remarks of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. If you review his participation in this debate, beginning at page 981 of *Hansard*, you will see that he is convoluting, squirming and wriggling in an attempt to justify the position he now takes. He even stooped to the level of providing us gratuitously with a 15-minute lecture on the bill and its effect. In effect, he suggests we are all stupid in this House because only he and those in his party understand what we are really talking about.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Would the hon. member permit a question? Would he allow me to apologize to him for having tried to explain this bill to him, since he cannot understand it?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I never ask any member to apologize to me in legitimate debate, and I never shall. I do think the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre perhaps owes the collective House an apology for deigning to set himself up as an expert on all things, not only this bill but all bills. No one in the House knows more than the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Thank you.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nielsen: I say that he and those behind him are betraying the working man by supporting Clause 2 of this bill.

An hon. Member: Oh, get on with it.

Mr. Nielsen: I am right on it. They are betraying not only the working man of this country who is unemployed, but the working man who has worked 35 or 40 years, contributing throughout those years to this fund without drawing a cent. That is the guy who is really annoyed at what is happening, and that is the individual this bill is really hitting.

I have just been handed a copy of *Maclean's* magazine for February, 1973. At page 4, there is an article covering the farewell remarks of the hon. member for Verdun on

Unemployment Insurance Act

leaving the Cabinet. It is headed "Farewell To Power. Departing Thoughts Of An Absent Cabinet Minister".

Mr. Baldwin: It should be Mackasey's eulogy.

Mr. Nielsen: This does not appear in quotation marks, but this is what is written:

And the Unemployment Insurance Plan? I can't understand all the fuss. Do people want to go back to the Hungry Thirties, the labour camps, the bread lines? The problem with this country isn't unemployment insurance, it's *unemployment*.

• (1610)

We can find no greater supporter of that contention than I. The hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) wishes to ask a question and I invite him to stand on his feet and not be so cowardly as to interject while remaining seated. The article goes on to read:

Seven per cent unemployment. And that's not the fault of the Manpower officials. The real culprits are those smug, arrogant civil servants in the Finance Department—

He chastised us yesterday for having been a little forceful with the chairman of the commission in the committee. He refers to the real culprits being "those smug, arrogant civil servants in the Finance Department". The article goes on to read:

—superbly confident of their ability to manipulate the economy with methods that should have died with Lord Keynes. They created the unemployment.

This is quite correct. They created the unemployment, and they are allowing it to continue.

Again, I hear remarks from my left. May I remind those to my left of that great press release which hit the streets with such a force on November 15, published by their party and released by their leader. At the top of the list of eight priorities was that they would give this government a while—I think the word used in the press release was "immediately"—to do something about unemployment. Let the hon. members to my left tell me of one measure that this government has introduced—and we are in the second month of this session—that meets that condition in their press release. Not a thing.

What they have done has been to remove the \$800 million ceiling because somehow, according to the hon. member for Verdun, if we pay out more money we are going to create more jobs. What they have done amounts to a big zero, and so much for the press release of the NDP whose bark is obviously a heck of a lot worse than their bite. They will find it very difficult to continue in this posture, supporting a government which they have condemned throughout the country and throughout the whole of the last parliament as well as in their press release of November 15. Now, they hang on like some desperate tail wagging the dog because they are frightened of going into another election. But in the meantime, the prostitution of their principles is not going unnoticed by the people of this country.

Mr. Alexander: Shame.

Mr. Nielsen: We have had at least an admission by the leader of that group to my left that there was some arrangement between his party and the party in power. It was not a marriage. I think the term he used was "a gentle