[*English*]

Ms. Dawn Black (New Westminster—Burnaby): Mr. Speaker, I rise with pleasure to speak on Bill C–55. It is a piece of legislation that I have looked over very carefully. It is in fact almost an omnibus bill. It deals with so many different aspects of pension legislation. I listened to the parliamentary—

● (2000)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Order, please. We are on Private Members' Business. It has not expired. I gave the floor to the hon. member expecting that she would speak about the private member's motion.

The time provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired.

[*Translation*]

Pursuant to Standing Order 96(1), the item is dropped from the Order Paper.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

PUBLIC SERVICE SUPERANNUATION ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Loiselle that Bill C–55, an act to amend certain acts in relation to pensions and to enact the Special Retirement Arrangements Act and the Pension Benefits Division Act, be read the third time and passed, and the amendment of Mr. Edwards (p. 12268).

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): At the suspension of the debate there were seven minutes remaining in the speech of the hon. member for Ottawa South.

Mr. John Manley (Ottawa South): Mr. Speaker, as we reached seven o'clock, the hon. member for Burnaby—Kingsway had posed a question to me with respect to MPs' pension plans and noted that he hoped I would be here at eight o'clock in order to give the reply.

Regrettably, the hon. member does not seem to have been able to make it back in order to hear my reply. However, I would like to make a few comments, particularly in view of the fact that he seemed to be, in his comments, claiming some kind of victory on behalf of his

leader for the fact that the President of the Treasury Board announced that an independent committee would be reviewing MPs' pensions. He talked a great deal about how this had been called for and how it had been promised, which is all very well.

What is unclear is exactly what the position of NDP members is on the issue. One would have thought part of that letter having been given that if they did indeed feel as strongly as their leader claimed to feel in her initial speech, that perhaps in the context of the parliamentary committee they might have moved a few amendments on the issue. Were there any amendments by the NDP?

An hon. member: No.

Mr. Manley: No amendments were moved. We have to guess what their position really is. We have to read the rumours that appear here and there about the reaction of their caucus. What we do know is that members of the NDP have succeeded very well in achieving some excellence in the art of double–dipping. We have some very good examples of former NDP members who have accepted very good positions with the federal government on top of their government pensions, including their former leader.

It is very hard to take seriously the question from the hon. member for Burnaby—Kingsway. He inquires at seven o'clock to run out the clock and then he is not really able to make clear what position it is that his party is trying to defend.

Mr. Ian Waddell (Port Moody—Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Burnaby—Kingsway is at a special dinner on foreign affairs. He is our foreign affairs critic. Maybe I could put the question again since the member did not answer it.

The question was quite simple. What was the Liberal position? The Liberals are famous for being mugwumps. Do you know what mugwumps are, Mr. Speaker? They are people who sit on a fence. They have their mug on one side and their wump on the other.

The Liberals are famous for this—on the trade deal, on the GST, on pensions, on everything. They try to be everything to everybody. At some point the mugwump starts to hurt a little bit, sitting as he does in the middle. So I will put the question again. What is the position of the hon. member's party, the Liberal Party? Or is he going to continue the tradition of mugwumpry among the Liberals.