

I share the opinion of Senators Forrestall, Corbin, and Simard. Something should be done. Seeing that no one is interested and not many people are listening, we will pass the bill, but I will vote against it just on principle. However, I need someone else to stand up with me to ask for a count. I will vote against it. It is something that should be studied. Let me put it this way: I will think about voting against it.

Pass the law if you want, but let us have a commitment that the Senate will look into it, because the Senate has the ability to show gentleness and kindness and patience to deal with such matters. It is not given to demagogy like we have seen in the House of Commons. Peacefully we can study the question of the First Nations, and peacefully we can study the pension plan. That is what the Senate does best.

Can you imagine the House of Commons studying euthanasia as the Senate has done with Senator Carstairs and others? Can you imagine the House of Commons doing that study across Canada and the demagogy that would be involved? That is why it is important that the Senate should deal with these questions.

If honourable senators read the bill carefully, they will be surprised at what they may learn. There are many little surprises in it. I do not think they are fair.

I have no fear about that. I contributed to the plan in the House of Commons. When I came from the House of Commons to the Senate here, I was not a defeated candidate. I was already a candidate. I am the only one who did not believe I could be elected, but everyone said I would be the first or second to be elected. My salary went down, but I am not complaining.

• (1510)

That was my choice, but I lost \$40,000 a year in income by going from the House of Commons to the Senate. Why should we not say that to the public? Forty thousand dollars less to do the same work that I did in the House of Commons.

With respect to my pension, as Senator Forrestall said, "Big deal." I will receive my pension at age 75, and it will start to be indexed at 75. That is no big deal when you are 60. I am not complaining; I am just reporting the difference.

Do honourable senators know — and I hope *The Hill Times* will report this fact — that we are paying for the pensions in the House of Commons? Check the facts. How many people survive the Senate after 75? Where does that money go? It goes to the general fund. There is not one fund for the Senate and one fund for the House of Commons.

No one answers these questions, honourable senators, and yet we will pass another bill. There was no study in the House of Commons — at least not a serious one. The members there were told to hurry up before the summer recess so that they would not be embarrassed by difficult questions during the summer. That was the problem. It was the same with other bills. When you start going to picnics in the summer, you may be questioned by

people. I ask honourable senators to stand up and speak on this subject. That is what I am doing.

I ask Senator Fairbairn to consider some of my proposals. The time may have come to bring an end to this misapprehension among the Canadian population about the pensions of members of Parliament. Hundreds of thousands of people hide behind us, happy that the debate is about us and not about them.

#### POINT OF ORDER

**Hon. Eymard G. Corbin:** Honourable senators, I rise on a point of order. Perhaps honourable senators would allow me to put a question to the Leader of the Government in the Senate, or to the Deputy Leader of the Government.

I noticed that neither the Leader of the Government nor the Deputy Leader of the Government in the Senate rushed to their feet at the end of Senator Prud'homme's speech. However, a number of senators — namely, Senators Simard, Forrestall, myself, and Prud'homme — have raised a number of points and issues concerning policy considerations. There is a disposition today, at least by most of us, to let the bills proceed through third reading and on their way to Royal Assent.

Honourable senators, I believe serious and valid points have been raised. In view of our willingness to help the government pass this legislation, it would be reassuring if we could have a commitment — perhaps that is too powerful a word — or a guarantee that the matters raised by the aforementioned honourable senators will be taken up at the table of power, and at the council of ministers, as an expression of our serious reservations about loopholes in the law, and about too loose a policy as it applies to pensions and other matters. That is all we want.

Honourable senators, we are not here to play political games. Indeed, if we so wished, we could force a vote on the issue. That is not our intention, but I think we have performed our duties in the brief period of time allotted for us to do so.

Some of these matters were raised in prior sittings of Parliament. It seems that we are speaking to those paintings on the wall. Nothing ever happens.

Can we have a commitment today from the Leader of the Government in the Senate that these will not remain dead words?

**Some Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Joyce Fairbairn (Leader of the Government):** Honourable senators, in reply to Senator Corbin and other senators, I can certainly give a commitment that these will not remain dead words. As senators know, an active and probably public debate will be carried on with respect to some of these issues in the months ahead.

I say to Senators Corbin, Prud'homme, Forrestall and others that I will transmit some of these suggestions to colleagues who are considering the broader issues at this moment.