

*Increased Cost of Living*

country the present government introduced the Canada Assistance Plan, which recognized that we had to develop a philosophy of social security and that no longer could we work with the old tools but had to have a more imaginative and flexible program, what do you think the Conservatives did, Mr. Speaker? They looked at it and probably thought that this could be creeping socialism. Nevertheless, they examined it. A number of them realized the advantages of the program. Others were perhaps a little critical, but they did discuss it realistically.

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, what did the members of the New Democratic Party do? They completely disowned it. What was their motive for doing this? Was it one of innocence, or of ignorance, of not understanding what it was? Can we say this of the party that holds itself up as the masters of reform? Is this the reason they did not understand the Canada Assistance Plan, or was there another reason, one which goes to the very roots of their whole approach to politics today and their efforts to exploit some of the growing pains that we are experiencing as a democracy? I leave it to you, Mr. Speaker, and to other hon. members to decide.

As I said at the beginning of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, in three years the record of this government in the field of social security is quite clear. The same can be said of the policies adopted by this government in other areas.

Far be it from any of us to say there is no room for discussion and debate of other questions which this government and this parliament might be tackling. Far be it from me to suggest that some things have been overdone and others not done well enough. But it is legitimate in debate to talk in these terms. However, to talk in terms of the speech of the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam yesterday is either to talk completely unrealistic nonsense, or I suggest, Mr. Speaker, it is to attempt to misinform and mislead the Canadian public as to the very functions of parliament. It is part of their whole, insidious campaign.

For too long, Mr. Speaker, has this little group sat. Many able men have sat with them in the past and there are many able men sitting with them at the present time. But the great thing they have forgotten, at least their leader has, is that they are out of date. The speech made by the hon. gentleman yesterday might well have had some relevancy 40 years ago. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that the

world has changed but that he has not changed with it.

In the area of reform today we have to be more sophisticated. We must recognize that although we have made progress in the last 30 years we have not made enough progress. There are still too many problems facing us, and we must ask ourselves how we are going to cope with them.

● (3:40 p.m.)

I draw the attention of this house to the speeches made by the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. MacEachen) and the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Turner). There we have two men who, in their speeches, look forward to the legislation this house must introduce. We must remember what they said if we are to have a meaningful debate. Are we not all in the same ball game? Unless we talk about the same things, how can we have a meaningful discussion. I suggest that the leader of the N.D.P., completely innocently I suspect, has done much damage to his cause. He should read some of the speeches made by his supporters, because they appreciate what has to be done more than he does.

Somebody has suggested that the leader of the N.D.P. is an anachronism, and that is the kindest thing I can say at this time, because I deplore the tactics he used last night in his speech. It is realistic to say, in a debate which is to have meaningful results, that this government or any government has not done enough. What the hon. member said sounded a great deal like contempt for the intellect of the average Canadian, because when that kind of speech is read by the average Canadian it must have a hollow ring. Some members of the house, among whom the leader of the N.D.P. is foremost, enjoy playing God. There are, none the less, many ways of going forward.

I suggest that the approach of the N.D.P. leader goes against the former approach adopted by his party. His approach will take us back, not forward.

**Mr. Colin Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** We have had two, shall I say, remarkable speeches in the course of this debate. We had one yesterday afternoon, and we had one begun yesterday and completed today.

First of all, I wish to deal with the remarks the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Olson) made last night. I had great sympathy for