

proposed in Bill C-28. However, I think the people of Canada, the Canadian taxpayers, should be aware of what is happening to them. I can assure you that when the bill comes to the committee it will receive the careful attention it so rightly deserves.

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear!

Hon. Jean-Maurice Simard: Honourable senators—)

The Hon. the Speaker *pro tempore*: Honourable senators, I wish to inform the Senate that if the Honourable Senator Simard speaks now his speech will have the effect of closing the debate on the motion for second reading of this bill.

[*Translation*]

Senator Simard: Honourable senators, I merely wish to comment on the fact that the Liberals are showing the same sincerity, the same desire to please everyone—students, bankers, chambers of commerce, large corporations, fishermen and farmers—they had during their many years in power and which even now marks their statements and grand speeches on equity and good management. I think Canadians have not forgotten that time, and the Liberals, including Senator Buckwold, will not let us forget because they still want to please everyone by suggesting there should be no tax increases, no corrective measures or work incentives of the kind found in Bill C-21.

The Liberals would have us believe that their magic recipe was a Godsend, although we all know that these Liberal policies put us into the financial straightjacket of a \$34 or \$30 billion annual deficit in 1984. If the Mulroney government had not stepped on the brakes, we would probably have an annual deficit of \$40 billion or a debt of \$500 billion.

Honourable senators, all this is no more acceptable in 1990 than it was in the seventies, when expenditures were starting to rise at a rate of 20 per cent annually. I would like to comment on a lack of intellectual honesty that seems to be typical of the Liberal philosophy. We will probably have a chance during the committee's proceedings—in a moment I intend to move that the bill be referred to the Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce—to say that it probably takes more guts to say no to the many requests we receive from Canadians, at all levels of society, than it takes to say yes, and it is especially true when these requests come at election time.

Senator Guay: You call that guts?

Senator Simard: We saw it in Canso last weekend, when the Liberal senators acted like cheerleaders, urging people to hold demonstrations and to be aggressive and "don't hold any punches", as they said. I don't think the people in Canso were fooled. And they won't be fooled by Liberal strategy in the future.

Senator Thériault: Senator Simard was.

Senator Simard: I know Senators Thériault and Gigantès find it hard to listen. Is anything bothering you, Senator Thériault?

Senator Thériault: You got on board in Canso!

[Senator Buckwold.]

Senator Simard: No, Senator Thériault, I was on board before I left. As I said in Canso and as I started to say yesterday, until the applause started, if there was a legitimate fear that certain measures might be too harsh and cause harm that was undue or in no way expected, the government might continue to accept or consider amendments. I have not changed my position.

Imagine, Senator Buckwold was saying what will happen 20 years hence. He is trying to predict what will happen 20 years from now, when according to him perhaps one million taxpayers will be affected by the clawback. I am sure the Liberal Party wants to make long-term plans, but I think there are some urgent items on which they will want to concentrate in the short term. Honourable senators, we are not denying that this bill is cause for some concern on this side of the chamber. That is what we were told in Canso and elsewhere. This is why Bill C-28 calls for higher accelerated taxes on big companies which do not pay taxes.

We were told that if employers and employees cannot pay a salary tax higher than what is proposed in Bill C-21 for example, and if students continue to need money and we do not want them to sink deeper into debt, and finally if we have to consider certain legitimate requests so as to take into account the evolution and the changes in society, then somebody will have to pay.

Speaking on behalf of big companies, Senator Buckwold denounces this measure which will cost them \$2 billion. That is not quite correct. I invite the Liberal senators to take part in the work of the committee which will study the bill and I intend to take part in the committee work with my colleagues. I hope the officials will give Senator Buckwold and me all the necessary technical and other information. As far as I am concerned, we need this legislative measure now.

Senator Buckwold has made a commendable effort to argue the point, but I suggest that the principle of universality remains untouched.

If you feel sorry for people earning \$80,000 a year who will have to pay back some of or all their old age pension or other benefits, I suggest you weigh the pros and cons and make up your own mind whether that might not be a better course than continuing to cut back through fat and lean both.

I would urge Senator Buckwold and his colleagues to state their position. He referred to the Chamber of Commerce. They are aiming much higher, talking about \$20 billion cut-backs over the next three or four years. Chamber of Commerce officials can easily say that, the decision is not theirs to make.

The government has gone over all programs in the past four or five years, attempting to trim some of the fat wherever possible. Every time we did that and sought Senate legislative approval, certain people on the other side told us it was an unwarranted attack against widows, orphans, poor fishermen, poor farmers. That is hardly the kind of attitude or approach or honesty Canadians expect from their elected or unelected representatives.