

Ms. Clancy: Madam Speaker, I thank the hon. member for Calgary Centre for his question.

In the past the former third party in the House, the New Democrats, used to be called Liberals in a hurry. I am not quite sure how we would make that correlation to the Reform Party members opposite, but I am not quite certain if they understand what happened yesterday. They know that 52 of us, I believe—the member for Beaver River does not qualify until March 13—became eligible yesterday. I am not being funny. I am being absolutely straight with the hon. member. None of those 52 people are going to retire overnight.

Miss Grey: No, but they are eligible.

Ms. Clancy: I am eligible for a lot of things. I could enter the Olympics. I am eligible. I am breathing but I probably would not do very well.

Mr. Silye: For what you have contributed you deserve a million dollars when you leave here?

Ms. Clancy: No, no, let me answer the question. The hon. member posed a question. Let me answer it.

First and foremost when the hon. member asked me the question, he opened the door and I am going to walk through it.

Miss Grey: Yes, you just did yesterday.

Ms. Clancy: Yes, I did. The answer is that we made a red book promise and we will keep the red book promise.

Mr. Abbott: When?

Ms. Clancy: When the Prime Minister and the President of the Treasury Board are ready. Our mandate is not going to end tomorrow. We are here. Much as the Reform Party may not like it we are here for at least another three years, maybe four and probably longer.

Let us talk about what Canadians want. Need I remind my hon. friends opposite, Canadians sent 177 of us to this House, a clear, overwhelming majority.

Miss Grey: They sent 178.

Miss Clancy: No, 177 and it went to 176. I know the numbers, I won a pool. They sent us in an overwhelming majority to this House based on the red book promises. The red book promises will be fulfilled. I know that, the minister knows that, the Prime Minister knows that, and in their heart of hearts the members of the Reform Party know that.

Heaven knows, if there is one thing I do not want to be in this debate it is partisan but I may get driven to it. If I get driven to it I will have to arrive there. I am driven to remind hon. members opposite that not only did the Canadian people send a clear majority of Liberals to the House based on red book promises, including the one we are talking about here, but does anybody

Supply

remember the 75 per cent approval rating in which the Prime Minister is held by the people of Canada today? Does anybody remember that? I do not know but there we are.

It hurts me to bring this up. It cuts me to the very quick to have to bring this up in debate. I am almost embarrassed to bring it up in front of the President of the Treasury Board because I am afraid it will diminish his hitherto good opinion of me. Does anybody remember that there is a party that is at 10 per cent in the polls? There is a Prime Minister at 75 per cent with a government at somewhere in excess of 60 per cent.

Mr. Silye: Mary, the election is in three years, so check that poll later.

Ms. Clancy: Exactly, the election is in three years. How grateful I am to the hon. member for Calgary Centre for bringing that up. There are all kinds of promises in the red book that will be fulfilled over the life of the mandate, including this one. I want the hon. members opposite to be calm, to not worry, to be happy—

Mr. Silye: Why was the Prime Minister in a hurry a year ago and now he is not in a hurry? Why the change? That is what is hurting. That is the perception that is wrong.

Ms. Clancy: Did he say which day? He did not say which day. The day will come and it will be a day that the Lord hath made and He can be happy and rejoice therein.

• (1235)

Mr. Stephen Harper (Calgary West, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I remind the hon. member that I knew of a party once that used to brag about its high standings in the polls. We all know where it is today. That may be interesting information but in and of itself will not get anybody re-elected.

The hon. member spent a considerable part of her speech defending what she perceived to be a personal attack on the member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell. As I heard the speech from the member for Kootenay West—Revelstoke he was really quarrelling with some very specific things that the member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell had said.

The most ridiculous thing he said was that it could be demonstrated that a private kind of RRSP purchase would be less generous to him than the current MP pension—

Miss Grey: More.

Mr. Harper (Calgary West): Sorry, if it was more generous, he would resign.

He actually suggested it would be more expensive if the public put us on RRSPs in a 1:1 matching arrangement. We know the current plan is a 6:1 matching arrangement. With all her rhetorical eloquence, is the hon. member seriously suggesting that she can make the number six less than a one?