

### Supply

**Mr. Szabo:** They get it for life but the calculations that have been provided as examples really go up to age 75 as an average mortality rate.

Would it not be fair simply to put all of the facts on the table? Most members are not here just to be here for six years. They are here to serve, as the member said; they are here to do a job. In many cases as we can see in this House that job goes on for 20 to 25 years. Those members of Parliament who serve their country, which presently is at a salary of \$64,400, have forgone the opportunity of their best earning potential during their career lifespan to serve in this House.

I wonder if the member would like to comment on whether or not the facts really are on the table and whether or not the full compensation of the members of Parliament ought not to be considered.

I personally agree there should be changes to eliminate the double dipping scenario. There should be changes to the date at which a member would qualify. I know the government has committed to making those changes and that those changes will be forthcoming at Christmastime. That is the undertaking this government has made to Canadians. We have listened and we are going to make those changes.

However let us never forget that members of Parliament are also family members. They have children. They have mortgages to pay. They have the ordinary costs of anyone else and they are entitled to a fair and reasonable compensation. As the member well knows all of the recent third party studies show that the contribution of members of Parliament in comparison with the corporate sector make their jobs worth at least \$100,000.

Would the member not agree that certain facts have not been put on the table? If he wanted to be fair with all Canadians he would make sure they had all these facts.

**Mr. Hanrahan:** Madam Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to respond to that question.

The key words the hon. member used were ordinary Canadians. Ordinary Canadians average 30 to 35 years before they receive a pension. Ordinary parliamentarians average six years. It would irritate ordinary Canadians to receive after 35 years what we receive after six years. I do not think the average Canadian would accept this in any manner, shape or form.

**Mr. Jim Silye (Calgary Centre, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, one year ago Canadians sent a clear message to Ottawa that they were tired of the status quo, hypocritical politicians. They subsequently voted in 205 rookies to the 35th Parliament. My speech is to the rookies. My message: Let us not let the veterans corrupt us.

When the voters fired the former frontbenchers, former backbenchers and former prime ministers, they took away their power but for most not their paycheques. We will be paying them for the rest of their lives millions of dollars. We as

taxpayers will be paying 30 per cent of the average of the last six years of their salary.

The issue before us today is the MP pension plan, technically described as the members of Parliament retirement allowance and retirement compensation allowance. Combined, the two plans force members to contribute 11 per cent of their salaries toward their retirement, or should I say toward an annual annuity one month after they leave public office regardless of age.

• (1150)

The result is a plan that is fully indexed, completely immune to inflation and payable for life with only six years of service required. Not bad. A lifetime annuity worth about \$19,000 plus, and a minimum collectable whether you are 35, 25 or 65 years of age or over just 2,100 days on the job.

For an MP to receive such a generous amount after only six years of service is ridiculous. The Government of Canada must contribute 5.85 times what the members put into the plan to meet the payments. I would suggest that in the very near future this ratio will continue to rise as more and more MPs are retired when voters vote with their feet, unless members pay more into the plan.

I submit this is why so many Canadian taxpayers are upset with MP pensions, considering them both unfair and unrealistic. What plan anywhere in the private or public sector in Canada or in any of the other G-7 countries that this government so proudly likes to compare itself to has such an overly generous matching amount from the government side?

In the name of justice and fairness I urge the government to correct this inequity immediately. What I am saying today is no different from what the Prime Minister when he was leader of the opposition said on August 13, 1993: "We will change the MP pension in one day". He has been here for one year and he has not done a thing except talk about changing double dipping and raising the age.

If that is all he is going to change, it is not enough. It is the overly generous matching contribution by the government that is annoying to the taxpayers of this country. That is what we cannot get through the heads of those Liberal members on the opposite side. I plead with them to show some leadership by example like Reform Party members.

We have all pledged not to take an MP pension in its current form. Yes, we pledged. The Liberals who are here can laugh, but we have pledged that because we want to show leadership by example. Some of us want to opt out of this current type of plan, but the fact is the government will not let us.

Many of us whether we can afford to or not have also taken a 10 per cent pay cut. It is not because MPs make too much money, but because as leaders we know that Canadians will need to sacrifice in the near future and we are prepared to lead by example at the top. Whether it is one of us, 52 of us or 35 of us is not the issue. As long as there is someone willing to lead Canadians will have hope. The Reform Party is here to provide