

*Government Orders*

Look at the other pensions they are getting. When hon. members opposite stand up and say they are not taking their pensions, why do they not also stand up and say: "The reason I am not taking my MPs' pension is because I am already getting a pension from another source". Why do they not come clean and tell us about that? I do not have a pension from another source, but some of the hon. members opposite I know do have one.

Why do those members not stand up and say: "I'm getting a pension from another source, so I don't need an MPs' pension. I'm happy to opt out". I know why. They would be embarrassed if they were caught double dipping later. It is amazing the members that are double dipping now are not confessing to it. We do not hear any talk about that. Why does the hon. member for Calgary West, in his white knight charger set of amendments, not propose the kind of amendments that will cut out the double dippers in his own party? Why will he not do that? I know why he will not. Because his leader told him not to.

His leader knows all about pensions and the way to collect pensions. His father was in the Senate which is a pension haven. Everybody knows that. His leader's father was a senator for years.

It is quite unbelievable that members of the Reform Party who speak on one side saying that we have to cut the pension will not speak on the other and say that we should cut double dipping more. Why will they not? They know all about double dipping. They are pros at double dipping. They know how to get big, fat pensions from other sources. I will not mention names but hon. members opposite know who I mean when I say there are people sitting there who are getting fat cat pensions of \$40,000, \$50,000, \$60,000 a year and they are earning their salary here as MPs at the same time.

In many cases those pensions are paid out of public funds. They may not be paid in every case by the federal government but they are paid out of taxpayers' funds.

We do not hear a word about it either from the Reform Party or from their friend David Somerville and the National Citizens' Coalition who is a mouthpiece for the Reform Party on this issue. The two of them have been in bed together for years.

The hon. member for Calgary West and the National Citizens' Coalition conspired together to defeat the former Tory member because of his views on the pension and on electoral reform. He knows that. He knows they have been working together to do this. The Reform Party members in the House and their performance in calling other members names, calling other members who have earned their pensions in good faith pigs, are absolutely disgracing this House. They should be ashamed of their conduct. The hon. member for Beaver River after her performance yesterday, threatening to beat up members of the House, should also be ashamed of her performance also.

• (1025)

**Mr. Strahl:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. In reference to the member's remarks during his intervention, where he accused a member of beating someone up, if he is accusing her of doing that in the House I wonder if he could retract that statement. It is absolute nonsense and he knows it.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Order, please. I have had the benefit of being in the chair for the better part, if not the entire portion, of this debate. I am well seized of the fact that it has been a very vigorous debate. I would say respectfully to the hon. member for Fraser Valley East that his point of order is a matter of debate. It is not a point of order according to our standing orders, our own rules in this House.

I would urge members on both sides participating in this debate to be judicious and to continue to be respectful of one another, and certainly of the collectivity of this institution, the House of Commons.

**Mr. Jack Frazer (Saanich—Gulf Islands, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, like my colleagues I rise to speak on Bill C-85 with a heavy heart and a sense of despondency.

Yesterday we were again reminded that there is no respect for the democratic process on the government benches. Once again they have not once, not twice, but three times invoked time allocation, thus stifling honest parliamentary debate on matters of great importance to Canadians.

It is perhaps appropriate that I speak after the parliamentary secretary to the government House leader because I am one of the people who he referred to as drawing a pension from the military. I have no trouble admitting that. I served for over 36 years in the military. I paid into a pension fund 7.5 per cent of my pay for 35 of those years, which was the maximum that I could qualify for. The fund from which I draw my pension is now \$30 billion and growing as people continue to contribute to it. Therefore, the idea that the taxpayer is paying my pension is absolutely ludicrous.

I have no regrets about it. Double dipping has been adequately defined as the retirement of a member of Parliament who has been appointed to a government job and continues to draw his pension and his salary at the same time.

I earned my place here. The people who elected me knew that I was drawing a military pension and they knew that I would be keeping that pension once I was elected. I feel there is no problem, but I have some doubts about the honesty and impartiality of the parliamentary secretary in this instance.

The Reform Party is placing before the House 35 amendments to Bill C-85. First, if implemented, these amendments would bring the MPs pension scheme into line with the private sector for both MPs and senators, and failing that, second, the amendments would change the opting out provisions so that newly