

Supply

term. I will. Perhaps the Deputy Prime Minister can learn from this what it means to keep a promise. Will she keep her promise and resign on January 1, 1996 if the GST is not scrapped?

This job itself with its responsibilities compared to the private sector is at least at a senior executive level and is deserving of a \$6,000 to \$7,000 salary per month. We should get rid of the MP pension plan, the tax free living allowance and the tax free expense allowance, limit members to two terms and offer the following: A taxable salary of \$10,000 to \$12,000 per month where members look after their own expenses and their own pensions. The \$10,000 per month is the current minimum as it reflects basically what MPs are paid now after we mark up the tax free aspects.

I personally believe that MPs should be paid more. However once they are removed from office Canadians should not be on the hook for about \$1 million per year per member. They should be given a private sector pension plan to which they pay 5 per cent, matched by the government on a 1:1 basis as opposed to 6:1 as is currently the case. Upon departure after two terms or whenever members would get a one time, one year severance to help re-enter the workforce and reintegrate their previous lives. This is more in line with the private sector and should make the voters and the politicians more respectful of each other.

Madam Speaker, may I ask for unanimous consent to continue for one minute? I have just three more paragraphs.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I am sorry. We do not have unanimous consent. Questions and comments. The hon. member for Mississauga South.

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I wanted to address a couple of the points the member raised. It is extremely important because it has painted a picture which is quite slanted and biased on behalf of the member.

First, throughout his statements he commented about his 10 per cent salary cut. If the member was going to give all the facts he would also report that as has been reported in the press Reform members are now reconsidering their 10 per cent cut because they are not getting enough publicity or benefit from it by the voters.

Second, the member seems to suggest that members of Parliament when they leave this place whether by choice or they are defeated in an election, can somehow simply integrate into the workforce.

• (1200)

The member knows very well that 82 per cent of the members who did not return from the last House do not have employment today. They have nothing to go to. As the member well knows, when members of Parliament leave here, having been defeated

in an election, they are a nobody. They are lower than a nobody because they no longer have the influence to speak with people and to have those contacts.

There are many members of Parliament and many others who have served in public life who have given so much that have nothing to go to when they leave public life.

On that basis the member probably should consider that the so-called gold-plated pension plan is in fact not just a pension plan for the future retirement of that member once that career ends but is also to provide some modicum of income protection or salary continuance because of the difficulty that members of Parliament have had to get back into the work force.

The member asks for a reasonable compensation package but you will note, Madam Speaker, that the member was not full and clear with the Canadian public because he did not mention a dollar figure. He is unprepared to say what a fair and reasonable compensation package would be.

Finally, the member made reference to a tax free allowance. The member said if you take this tax free allowance and convert it into an effective salary, the member of Parliament makes much more.

What the member failed to point out to Canadians is that members of Parliament received these allowances to take care of real legitimate expenses. As one example, as a member of Parliament I am here four or five days a week for nine months of the year. I must have a place here to live. That place costs me \$1,000 a month. That does not come out of some magical bin. It comes out of the tax free allowance.

The member should really consider whether or not he has told the Canadians the full truth.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): The hon. member for Calgary Centre. You have about a minute.

Mr. Silye: Madam Speaker, that is a nice application of the rules. I really appreciate it. I just heard the gun go off outside. That was hot air just like some of the hot air I am hearing in here.

When the hon. member's leader was Leader of the Opposition he said he wanted to reform MP pensions. He said he would raise the age to 55. We go to 60 so we support that a little higher. He said he would get rid of double dipping which he defines as receiving appointments from the federal level of government while on pension. We would support that as well. Whatever way you want to define double dipping you probably would find the Reform Party supporting it.

Where we fundamentally disagree and where his party is too weak, too void, too empty, lacking the political will, is to make the contributions matching so that if we give 11 per cent the federal government gives 11 per cent, or if we give five it gives five, no better than the private sector. Why should we be any