

try. Those old fools." That is what this government is saying.

This is not the Canada that I grew up in. Bill C-28 is a heartless, callous, cunning piece of legislation, sloppy in its creation, devious in its presentation, unacceptable to the parliamentary system, intolerable in its standards. Senior citizens beware. For all of you who are under 65 who have been counting on receiving old age security payments as part of your retirement income, the rules are about to change.

• (1630)

The government's own consultation paper on child and elderly benefits released in January 1985 had this to say about the idea of a surtax, another word for clawback, on old age pensions:

A special surtax on old age security payments to return more of the benefit paid to upper income pensioners would seriously disrupt our retirement income system, both for current pensioners and those now planning for retirement, and would unduly penalize those most affected by reason of retirement income resulting from private savings in earlier years.

That is what the government paper had to say. What has changed? Is this a new dawn? The clawback takes money that rightfully belongs to Canada's seniors.

In summary, the Minister of Finance must withdraw the bill and for good measure throw in an apology to seniors.

Mr. Kempling: Bullshit. You're sick.

Mr. Keyes: You have been here too many years. You forget what kind of place this is.

Mr. Kempling: You're sick.

Mr. Keyes: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. During the course of my remarks on this important bill, a bill under closure on which we will be voting in exactly half an hour, I wanted to state my concerns. During the course of my remarks there were remarks made—

Some hon. members: Oh, come on.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Order, please. If the hon. member has a point of order I wish he would come to it at this point.

Mr. Keyes: I was about to make it, Madam Speaker. The hon. member on the other side of the House made very callous and in fact rude, vulgar remarks heard by

other colleagues on my side of the House. I would think it appropriate that he apologize.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The Chair has not heard the remarks to which the hon. member for Hamilton West is referring. I am sure that if any hon. member feels that he or she should apologize, he or she will do the honourable thing.

In the meantime we will resume debate with the hon. member for Moose Jaw—Lake Centre.

Mr. Rod Laporte (Moose Jaw—Lake Centre): Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak on this bill, a bill that is going to put an end to universality in this country. This government has attempted to change the issue. It has been telling Canadians and telling us in the House today and for some period of time that it is simply taxing wealthy Canadians and that there is nothing wrong with that. Government members say that they are simply taking back what wealthy Canadians do not really need.

That is not the issue and that is not why we have been opposing this bill. In fact, as far as taxing wealthy Canadians or reducing the deficit is concerned, this bill brings in only something like \$300 million to \$500 million, which is relatively insignificant with respect to lowering the deficit.

We in the New Democratic Party believe in fair taxation and would certainly support real measures of reform that would bring about some real fair taxation.

The issue is universality. This issue is important because it attacks the very credibility of the government. In 1984 the Prime Minister talked about sacred trusts and approximately a year later he tried to deindex the old age pension. That was an assault on one of the most sacred trusts in this country. It was only because seniors rose up in huge numbers and opposed the measure that the government backed off. Now it is doing the same thing, except it is coming in from the back door.

The government promised before the last election that it would introduce an extensive child care program for this nation. The government made \$25 billion worth of commitments that it said would be put in place after the election, but they have not been put in place. There is no child care program and most of the other \$25 billion of commitments promised by this government have not been met.