

with that, but we do not agree that deficit reduction should be made on the backs of families and senior citizens.

This amount of money is a pittance. This amount of money could be raised very easily by increasing the upper margin on the income tax from 29 per cent to 32 per cent. This would raise more than the \$500 million rather than use this discriminatory tax on seniors and families.

The final justification for the amendments from the Senate: "While the committee does not favour the clawback in principle, nevertheless it is reluctantly prepared to accept this provision in recognition of the serious, fiscal circumstances facing the government." The Senate has said to the government: "We agree with you. You have got a real deficit problem."

In principle we do not like clawback, but I think we are going to have to go ahead with many of the measures in Bill C-28. One could say that there might be some duplicity, but I do not accept that fact. I really do not.

One senator has been attributed as saying: "I passed around a copy of the amendments to the shareholders, the directors—I am sorry, I mean the senators." Surely at this point in time a Senate that spends \$40 million per year could have done a bit better. It could have come forward with much more stringent and severe amendments to this clawback bill and we could have easily endorsed it.

• (1720)

We are the only party left that will defend universality in its totality. Those words are not necessary side by side because they are one and the same, but we are the only party that defends it.

Perhaps I am going backward because the member for Kingston and the Islands has already referred to it, but the chronology of this bill was an horrific experience for a new member and it would be an horrific experience for an experienced member. I will not bore the House with the details other than to say that no witnesses were to be heard. It was very important that we pass Bill C-28 before Christmas. Five witnesses out of a possible twenty-two were heard. Time allocation was used at committee stage and time allocation used in the House.

### *Government Orders*

I on behalf of the New Democrats introduced nine amendments, six of which were in order, I am proud to say, and none of which the government would accept. The government introduced 125 amendments to its own bill. This is unheard of; I could not find another precedent for it. The government said that it would introduce another bill in the new year and look after those amendments.

**Mr. Manley:** Were they in order?

**Mr. Butland:** No, they were ruled out of order. My hon. friend from Ottawa South asks if they were in order. No, the government's amendments were ruled out of order. That is some indication that this bill was flawed from the beginning and remains flawed. I do not know where these amendments are, and I suspect the government does not know either.

This is destroying the vision of Canada as we on this side understand it: a caring, compassionate Canada. Although this is an almost trite expression now, but this is a change in the watershed of social policy for this country. It follows in the footsteps of the UI bill. We have grave reservations as to what may come in the future. We believe that big business is having its way. It wants to attack the social programs of this country in order that it can compete and that it will have a level playing field with the Americans. At whose expense will this be? This will be at the expense of seniors. This will be at the expense of young families.

The argument is always proffered that it will only affect 4 per cent. They have never extrapolated as to what will happen in the future. By the year 2000, we say that 25 per cent of seniors will be affected. It is not only the 65-year-old. We are talking about the 55-year-old. We are talking about the 45-year-old. We are talking about all Canadians who will be affected by this clawback.

I think I have given our party's position on this matter. I will conclude by saying that we are quite disappointed in the Senate that has the authority, we believe, to come back with a much stronger message. We do not agree with the Senate's presence. It is not one of us; there are none of us over there. If it is going to be there, it might as well do something and do it with principle and will. The Senate knew full well that it was only a delay and