

they were responding to a new scapegoat and that that would somehow take the heat off. They were going to be a government of restraint. I do not think that will happen because this bill reflects the government, and what this bill will say to the people on the streets of this city—

Mr. Lamontagne: This city?

Mr. Crombie: I was thinking of Quebec city, actually. People will say that this bill and this government are unjust and unfair to people because they hit both the guilty and the innocent. This bill is unfair and unjust to the regions because it hurts those which are already hurting. It is unjust and unfair to two levels of government which will be overcome by millions of dollars of welfare costs, social service costs and lost income for which they could not and did not budget because there was no consultation. People will say that the government is confused and incompetent, and that it has kept them in the same muddle they were in before the government brought in this bill. Finally, they will say that this government has become so old in office that it has become cynical, even though it does not know it is cynical. That is why, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I have to interrupt the hon. member because his time has expired.

Some hon. Members: Let him continue.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: He may continue with the unanimous consent of the House.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Cullen: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): He hurt you, did he?

Mr. Cullen: No. I was trying to be a gentleman here tonight. We have been dealing with motion No. 1, and many hon. members have spoken. There has been wide latitude allowed by the Chair. I appreciate that, and I think all members of the House do. However, the fact is that members on both sides have spoken once on this motion and, of course, do not have the opportunity to speak again. I wonder if we could move to the second motion and perhaps give other hon. members an opportunity to speak.

Mr. McGrath: You brought in closure, Bud, not us.

● (2052)

Mr. Cullen: From our standpoint, we have not heard anything new today except the con in Conservative has been proven once again. Members opposite have something to say about the two-tier system and voluntary quits, but the Conservative party does not seem to want to give them the opportunity.

Unemployment Insurance Act

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mr. Cullen) will carry the message to the government House leader, so that he will not be so free with allocating time the next time around. I just want to say to my friend, if he cannot stand there and take the heat, he should not stand up and make excuses.

Mr. Rob Parker (Eglinton): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on clause 1 of this bill, once again we have before the House a band-aid bill, another set of amendments on amendments on amendments. Over the days the bill has been debated in the House there has been considerable discussions concerning the closure motion which the government brought in and passed. We have had some detailed discussions on some areas of the proposed amendments but not all. That will not be possible because of the short time.

It would be worth while to examine exactly what the government purports to do with the bill, exactly what our responsibilities are as legislators in reviewing it and voting on it. The first thing which seems irrefutably clear is that Canadians want reform in the area of unemployment insurance. That has been demonstrated by the government's opinion polls. The government has released papers on it, and has been taking polls for over a year. It has been demonstrated by polls published in the popular press, by media reports, and by the reaction which every member of the House receives from his constituents.

When Canadians say they want reform, I do not think they are necessarily saying that they want the House or the government to penalize the needy. They are not saying they want government to begin to be cruel or heartless. They are not saying that they want to put the wounded in the front lines. But, they want cutbacks in the outrageous costs of this program. The neediest people in Canada among working Canadians are those wage earners who have dependants. They may be single parent families or families where the wife does not work and is at home with the children. Those are the neediest families in terms of deserving protection. While Canadians want reform, there is no sign at all that they want the government to stop protecting people against misfortune.

Over the past few years there has been a clear pattern of encouragement to abuse within the rules and regulations of unemployment insurance. My colleague and seatmate, the hon. member for York-Scarborough (Mr. McCrossan), spoke about it. Other members have spoken on it. There has been a pattern of that kind of encouragement. That would be bad enough, but the encouragement has gone beyond that. The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) of this country has gone on record on numerous occasions saying that he will not tell anyone they must work; if people want to collect unemployment insurance and not work, that is their perfect right. When the highest political officer in the land tells Canadians that, particularly young Canadians, surely they take him seriously. Surely they get the idea that it is all right to rip off the system.

We have not had government leaders, cabinet ministers and politicians on the government side talking about the value of