

different, any more special? The MP compensation package should—

**Mr. Szabo:** Time.

**Mr. Silye:** Don't tell me to hurry up. You are the one who was taking the time and hogging my time with your comment. So if you are interested in my comment in response—you're not. That figures. That's the government. That's the government side—

**Ms. Clancy:** I'm interested. Talk to me.

**Mr. Silye:** There is a lady across the way who keeps interfering, Madam Speaker. I think I should be allowed another five minutes to respond because of the heckling.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** I am sorry. The time has expired.

I am now ready prior to recognizing the hon. parliamentary secretary to rule on the amendment proposed by the chief government whip.

After consideration the Chair must rule that the proposed amendment by the hon. chief government whip is out of order because it goes against citation 579 of Beauchesne's sixth edition as it sets forth a proposition dealing with a matter which is foreign to the proposed proposition involved in the main motion and as it raises a new question. Second, it goes against citation 929 of Beauchesne's which states:

On an allotted day, during consideration of the business of Supply, an amendment must not provide the basis for an entirely different debate than that proposed in the original motion.

• (1205)

Also, as quoted in the "Selected Decisions of Speaker La-moureux" on page 322, it was ruled by the Chair on March 16, 1971 that:

—for an allotted day, "the spirit of fair play would require that the day not be taken away by means of an amendment".

**Ms. Mary Clancy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.):** Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**Mr. Silye:** Do you want to talk louder so everyone will hear you?

**Ms. Clancy:** Now, now. I would ask that the hon. member for Calgary Centre listen. He might hear something that he might even like.

**Mr. Silye:** Should I hold my breath?

**Ms. Clancy:** Probably not, although I am sure you can try.

I have been in this House six years yesterday when I was elected.

### Supply

Oh, please wait to hear what I have to say, ladies and gentlemen.

Six years ago last night was one of the most exciting and humbling moments of my life. The opportunity to be a member of Parliament, to serve the people of Halifax and, I hope, to serve the people of Canada as everyone of us in this House does—some of us whether we like it or not—is something that maybe a lot of us never even dreamed of when we thought about the way our lives would go.

I want to say something else. I think most people in this House who know me know that I am a very partisan member of Parliament and I am proud of that partisanship. I come from a partisan tradition in my family, in my province, in my region and in my party. However, I think that this is an amazing and wonderful place.

**Mr. Silye:** So now the thinking is hereditary?

**Ms. Clancy:** Is this the new politics, Jim?

I look over to the other side, to the members of the Reform Party, and I want every one of them, particularly the member for Beaver River, to know that I hold them in great respect. I disagree with them on many, many issues but I hold them in great respect as members of Parliament, as representatives of the people, as fellow Canadians and as colleagues in this House. I congratulate the member for Beaver River for bringing forward this motion. This matter needs debate.

I am going to veer off briefly in a lighter vein to my colleague and good friend, the member for Mississauga South, and say that I thought I was going to burst into tears before he finished his intervention. There are a number of good reasons for the proper remuneration of members of Parliament. I congratulate the member for Calgary Centre again—take it while you can—on his comments about proper remuneration. He is absolutely right.

We all know right now that political suicide, which is something that I do not think any of us are interested in committing, would be to raise salaries. I think that what really needs to be done over the long term is what is said in the red book. I would be happy to read it in the French version which I have right here. It states that the entire thing needs revamping.

In the meantime, and I am only going to deal with this briefly and I will come to it later in my speech, I support very strongly the elimination of double dipping while at the same time not disagreeing with the member for Kootenay West when he talked about his 22 years as a civil servant, an air traffic controller, one of the most stressful and difficult jobs and one of the most important jobs in this country. The issue is a complex and complicated one on both sides.

I can bring up examples particularly in my previous incarnation in opposition when I was charged with the role of women's