

other end. We give tax breaks to corporate friends. Nobody ever believed that this government—

An hon. member: How about our co-operative partners?

Ms. Langan: We can talk about that. Let's talk about that. You can ask me questions about that when I am finished speaking, hon. minister.

I do not have to make any apologies for the basic principles of New Democrats, nor will I make apologies. I would like to ask hon. members some questions about their basic principles, but this is not the place to do it.

The kind of thing we need to discuss in this House is how we find ourselves faced with a piece of legislation from a Tory government that supposedly grabs back from the rich today.

An hon. member: That is right. Today.

Ms. Langan: I have already stated, and I will state it again. If you are earning \$30,000 today and you are 30 years old, by the time you retire your pension will be clawed back. If you earn \$40,000 today and are aged 40, by the time you retire, your pension will be clawed back. Do not tell me that it is being clawed back from the rich. It is the well-to-do. Fifty thousand dollars is not rich today. It is the well-to-do today, and tomorrow it is the poor. Do not try to fool Canadians.

An hon. member: That's who they are after.

Ms. Langan: Do not try to fool Canadians by saying that you are taking this money from the rich. You are taking this money today from middle-income Canadians and tomorrow from the poor Canadians.

It is absolutely critical for Canadians to take a look at the fact that this Tory government has yet again tried to fool Canadians into believing that they are doing them a favour by taking from the rich when in fact their intent is to take from average and poor Canadians. At the same time we have a Liberal Senate that claims in the loftiest of terms to be committed to universality coming back with a couple of measly little amendments when in fact it has the power to stop this legislation.

There are those who have said to us: "Well, suddenly New Democrats are embracing the Senate". Not true. In fact, what we are saying is if there is a Senate there, let's put that Senate to work to protect Canadians. If there is

any kind of heart in this government, if it can get its act together—and there seems to be a little bit of difficulty over there even figuring out what we will do from day to day around here—I would plead with it not to rely on the Senate to withdraw this bill, but to have the courage and respect for the Canadian people, the people who are building this country, the people who have indeed built this country in the name of our pensioners, and withdraw this bill.

Mr. Steve Butland (Sault Ste. Marie): Madam Speaker, I congratulate my hon. colleague for her fine speech.

I do not think Canadians ever get tired of hearing what a heinous group this group opposite really is. When talking about unjust, iniquitous, obscene legislation, the member cited that one particular clause where a married couple, each earning \$49,000 for a total of \$98,000, will not be clawed back on their family allowance, but a single parent earning \$50,001 will have his or her pension clawed back. Why would the government allow this obvious unjust legislation to come forward without an amendment of its own? Second, why would the Senate not introduce an appropriate amendment?

Ms. Langan: Madam Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question.

First of all, why would this government introduce such an unfair piece of legislation? God only knows why. This government is becoming infamous. It will go down in history as being the government that has consistently, time after time after time, introduced legislation that is not only outrageous and iniquitous and all of those things, but is indeed unfair.

• (1810)

As to why the Senate has not done something about it, I cannot speak for the senators, but I am quite surprised that the Senate, in its proposed amendments, has not addressed that subject. The most frustrating thing about all of this is that this government and this minister who is backing the motion not to support the amendments of the Senate would not, after all this government has heard about the inequities and the unfairness in this legislation, have addressed these inequities. I would hope that when I sit down the hon. minister would get up and do just that.

An hon. member: He will.