

*Supply*

● (1010)

**Mr. Milliken:** Madam Speaker, I know the hon. member is apparently dissatisfied with the very lengthy response he received to his important question.

It was tabled as an Order for Return of the House and it applied only to the third year of the three for which he asked. Naturally the government is anxious to provide all the information it can to the hon. member. I express my concern that the answer was apparently incomplete when we received only the one year.

I was informed that the cost of rooting out the other years is very substantial and that unless the hon. member is quite insistent on getting the answer that it would not be forthcoming because it would cost so much to get it.

Might I suggest that if the hon. member is serious in wanting this additional information, I have no objection to getting it for him at some cost. I am quite prepared to request that it be provided.

I would suggest that since the question has been made an Order for Return and the return has been tabled, it would be appropriate for him to put the question on the Order Paper again, at least in relation to the two years for which he has not received an adequate response. I would then instruct officials to get the necessary information to the hon. member.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** Is this on the same point of order? This is not debate.

**Mr. Scott (Skeena):** Madam Speaker, yes it is. It is not on debate.

I appreciate there may be some cost associated with the government tabling the information in the House. However it is important for the Canadian people and for accountability that we do see the information. I would ask the government to pursue the information with the appropriate officials in the government.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** Shall the remaining questions stand?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

### SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY—MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT RETIREMENT ALLOWANCE

**Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River, Ref.)** moved:

That this House urge the government to replace the current members of Parliament retirement allowance plan with a pension plan that reflects the current norms for private sector pensions, with a maximum contribution in accordance with the Income Tax Act.

She said: Madam Speaker, I am very pleased that we finally get a chance to debate this matter in the House. Yesterday trough day arrived and we see the important need for changes to the members of Parliament pension plan.

It is unfortunate that the government did not live up to its red book promise and make the changes before trough day yesterday. That certainly would have sent the signal loudly and clearly to the Canadian public.

The Members of Parliament Retiring Allowances Act is a very modest statute introduced in 1952. In the last dozen years or so it has become really divisive. It is destructive. It is an unfair and detested piece of legislation in the eyes of most Canadians.

I draw the attention of the House to a report that was just brought in by a commission to review allowances of members of Parliament. This plan was started in 1952, which is interesting because that is the year I arrived on the scene as well. We might take notice that the prime minister of the day, Louis St. Laurent, said they wanted to make sure what was happening in those days in terms of the public service made it impossible for somebody who was serving as a member of Parliament to provide adequately for his later years.

I appreciate that pensions are good things. A pension scheme is not wrong at all. But this particular MP pension is a "scheme a dream" when you think about what has gone on in the last several years to make sure MPs look after themselves. We need to come up with a plan that is fair and is going to sell itself to the Canadian taxpayers who are funding the pension plan.

● (1015)

I do not consider myself nor do I consider my friends across the aisle, who have just qualified for trough day yesterday to get an MP pension, later years. March 13 is my date coming up, and I make full awareness to the people of that. I mentioned it in Question Period the other day. If the government does choose to put in MP pension reform I find it very strange that it would do it to its own members to make sure that they were in safe as of November 21. I have a feeling that it is going to make changes before March 13 so that I may be set up as the fall guy. I do not mind being set up as the fall guy if there are going to be substantive changes to the pension plan. We want to see that.

I am being assured by my friend across the aisle that they will look after that or they will look after me. Nothing makes me more nervous than having Liberals say that they are going to look after me. I will look forward to any remarks in the future from the member for Kingston and the Islands when he discusses this plan I am sure later.