

Supply

do not deserve it". However, when it gets over there: munch, munch, crunch a munch at the trough.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Ghislain Lebel (Chambly, BQ): Madam Speaker, Bloc Quebecois members find this morning's debate a little funny because we do not intend to stay here very long and will not need the pension plan. Quebec's representatives will certainly leave this chamber before long; we predict that it will happen in 1995.

However, what I find really funny this morning is what I could call Reform's self-flogging exercise over salaries. These people, who engage in grandstanding at the drop of a hat, regularly come here to talk about cutting the salaries of overpaid members, despite last year's Price Waterhouse study stating that members of the House of Commons are underpaid.

Strangely enough, we do not hear much about the members of that party who collect both their salaries as members of Parliament and their pensions as former army generals or members of provincial legislatures.

What is the point of this? I wonder how sincere they are when they make such comments. Could it be that they found a cheaper way to engage in grandstanding? The day when a member of the Reform Party can prove publicly that he has decided not to collect the various pensions accumulated in the armed forces or elsewhere, he may earn the respect of the other members here today.

Furthermore, I wonder if the money they will save on voluntarily uncollected pensions will be spent on enlarging prisons, since they are so keen on incarcerating people for longer periods. Their right-wing policies are not very consistent with what they said this morning.

So until Reform members can prove that they are acting in good faith and that those eligible have voluntarily forgone the benefits accumulated in other pension funds, allow me to question their good faith and their honesty in this House.

[*English*]

Mr. White (Fraser Valley West): Madam Speaker, there is one thing I agree with, the statement by the hon. member from the separatist party that he does not plan to be here too long. I can agree with that. We hope he is not here very long either.

I really think the question was about the savings that we get from this pension plan. I do not know if the hon. member heard but we are actually borrowing about \$40 billion a year to run this country. We are spending \$40 billion more than we take in. I kind of think it would be a good idea, although it is hard to convince the Liberals about this, to try to pay that down. What do you think of that? Maybe we could just try to balance the budget for a change.

It is not just a matter of taking the money from some of these ridiculous accounts and trying to find out what to do with it. This is a very principled issue. The question is whether or not people after six years of service anywhere deserve a pension as exorbitant as this one. The answer according to the taxpayer is no, so why do we spend all of this time trying to coax this government into change? We should not be here doing this. Everybody in this room knows that these changes have to be made and there should not be debates.

• (1120)

Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay West—Revelstoke, Ref.): Madam Speaker, when I was getting ready to come to the House today to speak I turned on the parliamentary channel and I listened to the member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell. As a result of listening to what I think was fairly accurately described by my colleague from Prince George, I found it necessary to change a lot of what I was going to say.

The hon. member suggested that this is an honourable profession and that it is great of us to be here, him included. In the same breath he went on to talk about the remuneration of an MP and the benefits, referring to it as "those things that bring us here". Perhaps that is what brings members of the Liberal Party here but I can assure you, Madam Speaker, that it is not what brings members of the Reform Party here.

He also discussed at length the concept of the RRSP as an alternative to the MPs pension. He talked about the suggestion that this is what should be done with our pensions. Then he put out a challenge to the gentleman who raised this, suggesting that if he can show how he could make more through RRSPs and this type of thing that he would in fact resign. It would be wonderful if we could bring that about.

That being what it will, he is suggesting he wants the maximum dollar he can get, the maximum benefits. The only way he is interested in change is if we can prove to him that he is actually going to get more. There is no intent of sacrifice there, no intent of recognizing the financial situation Canada is in, only will he make more if we make some change in that direction.

He then went on to suggest that it was a red herring, that the Reform was cooking up false numbers because there really is no deficit in the pension plan, that although people retire and get these huge gold-plated pensions there are more people coming into the House and as a result they will pay in and this will make it all right.

The member obviously does not know anything about the concept of cumulative effect. In fact that may well explain why we are five hundred and thirty-some odd billion in debt and going up at the rate of almost \$1,500 a second because of the cumulative effect not only of the overspending by the Tories in the last nine years but the Liberal Party before that.