

Income Tax Act

on this particular issue? Of course, the Government understood that he had signed the finance committee's report, but perhaps he could make himself absent on that particular day in order for the Hon. Member for Fraser Valley East to take part.

Is that what took place? I am not sure what exactly happened because I am not privy to the things that happen on the back-benches of the Government.

The Hon. Member for Beauharnois—Salaberry (Mr. Hudon) has never, in my three years in this House, shown the slightest interest in matters which touch upon the finance committee or on any economic matters at all. I am not permitted to comment on whether or not he is in the House, but I am sure if he is he will pop up to explain his sudden attendance at the committee and his sudden insistence at the time the vote was taken on replacing some other member on the committee.

The Hon. Member for Capilano (Mrs. Collins) popped up as well. I am not sure if she was recently appointed to the committee or not, but she too had not been involved with the committee until it came time to vote on this particular measure. Since she represents many people from the Chamber of Commerce and the banking community in Vancouver who live in her constituency in West and North Vancouver, she hastened to vote the way the Government wanted her to vote. So it went.

I say that that was a shameful day in the life of the Commons finance committee and I say it is shameful that the Government packed the committee in the way it did.

Mr. George Baker (Gander—Twillingate): Madam Speaker, I have a few words to say concerning this Bill. I was surprised to hear members of the New Democratic Party talking about the goon squad. I would like to have listened to more of the information the hon. gentleman was imparting. The only goon squad about which I thought he would talk was the goon squad that some people say will exist in a section of the Unemployment Insurance Act which is to be amended by this Bill under which persons are identified as collecting unemployment insurance when they are not supposed to be collecting it.

The title of the Bill is an Act to amend the Income Tax Act, a related Act, the Canada Pension Plan and the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971. This big Bill is supposed to create jobs in Montreal and Vancouver. I think it is supposed to create 26 jobs. No, according to the Deputy Minister for Tax Policy Division, Department of Finance, 11 jobs will be created. That is so, but Mr. MacIntosh, the President of the Canadian Bankers' Association, estimated that some 26 jobs would be created, not 11.

I imagine that more than 26 jobs were required to print this Bill. I suppose the purpose of the Bill is to create 26 jobs. I do not know where the jobs will be. How many jobs will be created in Montreal and how many jobs will be created in

Vancouver? I imagine that will be the subject of the next cabinet meeting. Will 15 jobs be created in Montreal and the rest created in Vancouver? Where will the jobs be? According to the Canadian Bankers' Association, there will be 26 jobs, but there will be 11 if we accept the word of the Assistant Deputy Minister and the word of the hon. gentleman who spoke a few moments ago.

● (1240)

One would expect this Bill would deal with the Unemployment Insurance Act and the Canada Pension Plan. It does. It makes more amendments to more sections of the Unemployment Insurance Act than I would have time to mention.

If we are going to amend the section of the Unemployment Insurance Act that deals with eligibility or overpayments to recipients, one must wonder where the priority of the Government is. Those sections of the Act are being amended here today. If you were to say to someone affected by the overpayment section of the Act that it is being amended today in the House of Commons, somebody would say, my goodness, is it being amended so that at least I get a chance to appeal the decision made by the Government on my unemployment insurance? You say no, that is not what is being amended. Well, they say, what is being amended, because that is what it deals with?

If you said to someone else that the section that deals with undue hardship is being amended today in the House of Commons, somebody would say, my goodness, it is being amended today! That section of the Unemployment Insurance Act says that a person will not have to pay monies back to the treasury if it creates undue hardship to that person. Somebody would say, my goodness, that is a very good thing to amend to make it clear at least that the Government would be able to give us more of a break. I mean, we have not seen the Government of Canada use that section for ages, perhaps simply because the Minister or the commission did not want to forgive the debt.

Let us not forget, we have a system in place in Canada today where all of the bureaucrats, all of the managers, all of the fellows receiving big salaries can receive a big Christmas gift now if they cut back more, and collect more money for the Government of Canada.

If you were to say to somebody that section is being amended today in the House of Commons by Bill C-64, somebody would say yes, that is what Members of Parliament should be talking about today in the House of Commons. That is, to give us a break so that perhaps we will not have to pay back as much.

After all, they did not make the mistake under this section that is being amended. The people who made the mistake were the employees of the Unemployment Insurance Commission. The computer made the mistake. It was not their error but they have to pay it back. Well, it is nice that the section is being amended today. Perhaps the Government of Canada is