

than she is allowed under the unemployment insurance regulations.

How do they do it? They do it with computers. They simply cross-match the reports of the employers with the computers that they have in the unemployment insurance commission office. They can find those people.

I think that what they are doing here is the result of lack of imagination. If nothing else, it certainly is sloth. It is inconceivable to me that in this technological age we live in, this government cannot tax people based on how much money they make in relation to how much they ought to be taxed under the Income Tax Act. It is terrible to even suggest that there are some people who are getting money from the government which they ought not to get, to suggest that it is impossible for the government to tax back, not claw back the amount of money in excess of what we as taxpayers ordinarily pay.

There are not very many taxpayers in this country who do not realize that you have to pay taxes. Something that we absolutely object to is this erosion, it is worse than erosion, of the universality which has become such a part of the fabric of Canadian society. It is far more than an erosion. It is a devastation. The words escape me right now but it is an absolutely horrendous thing that this slothful, mean-spirited government would bring in.

It suggests that indeed, as with everything else they seem to put their hands to, government members are incompetent, so incompetent that as we take part in this debate, we find ourselves under closure again. Wonder of wonders.

This is about the tenth or twelfth time since I came to Parliament, I was going to say a year ago, and it is true, that we have been under closure. We were under closure on free trade but that was only one or two instances. Since April when we came back and started Parliament in earnest, this is the tenth or twelfth time I have risen to speak under closure.

What an unimaginative group we have over there. What a mean-spirited, unimaginative group who seem not to be able to do anything constructive, who seem not to be able to come up with imaginative programs for the creation of jobs, for the creation of well-paying quality jobs so people can have some kind of a satisfaction with what they do within society rather than flipping ham-

Government Orders

burgers and going to work for welfare as they seem to have done so well and have bragged about in connection with some programs they have in my native province of Saskatchewan. Work for welfare, can you imagine anything so obscene? I suspect that "obscene" was the word I was trying to find earlier.

One of the best examples of the incompetence of this government is the bill itself. It was so flawed by their own admission that government members had to bring in 125 amendments to their own legislation, only to withdraw them.

I suppose if you look at flawed legislation and if you look at having to withdraw amendments you make to it, you would have to conclude that what you have there is a couple of negatives. I am sure the chairperson of the finance committee can tell me—the great mathematician that he is—that two negatives make a positive.

I fail to understand how something as broad as the bill originally was without the withdrawn 125 amendments can possibly, except perhaps in the eyes of the government opposite, add up to a positive. I suspect that it may possibly be that when you are talking mathematics, two negatives do make a positive. When you are talking in terms of social programs and social legislation, when you are talking in terms of pensions for our seniors, when you are talking in terms of family allowances, I suggest that these two wrongs certainly do not make a right. It is rather obvious that the exact opposite is true.

• (1610)

How can anyone say that these people, defenseless like most wage earners are, ought to have a certain amount of their rightful earnings taken away? One of the previous speakers pointed out and, it is entirely true, that Canadians have had their taxes deducted in the past for the right to receive old age assistance when they reach the age of retirement. This government is saying no.

I suppose they have lost their computers. I suspect they are not going to be taking into account how much those people contributed, how much they ought to receive as a result of those contributions. They have thrown the computers out and they are going to be clawing back from that old age security. That is, by any definition, theft.