

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA,
8:00 o'clock P.M. Saturday, May 8th, 1965

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question and the motion?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I was speaking at 5:30 and I will continue if I may. During the break, the intermission of the supper hour, I had the opportunity to read further into the Honourable the First Minister's remarks when he spoke on the Throne Speech giving his views and I presume the views of his group on the Canada Pension Plan, and while I had covered part of his remarks earlier on, I found that I had left some points out that may be applicable to the plan we have under consideration, and if I may quote, on page 225, and this is the Honourable the First Minister speaking: "I want to read to you what I said to the Government of Canada on the subject of Pension Plan so that my honourable friends opposite will know what our views are. This was taken from a statement made last December 7th to Ottawa and I read it in part 'The Canada Pension Plan. Most Canadians and certainly the Government of Manitoba, - mark this - ; want better pensions for our people, and it may be that of its kind the Canada Pension Plan is a good one -- of its kind. It is true that in its original form this plan started as a pay as you go system (If I may interject it's slightly different to the one under consideration) It is true that in its original form this plan started as a pay as you go system with lower rates of contribution and this was strongly defended by federal ministers on grounds of economic policy. This aspect of the plan has been changed to more clearly approximate a funded plan and this has now been equally strongly defended on economic terms by the federal administration. They are handy with arguments on both sides. It doesn't seem to matter. There seems to be some unresolved questions to be ventilated in this connection. Manitoba however, has expressed from the beginning it's deep concern about the effects of the Canada Pension Plan levy on our ability to raise funds for other public purposes.' "

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to interrupt my honourable friend, but is he talking about the pension plan here in Manitoba or the Canada Pension Plan? I only ask this so that I may follow my honourable friend. --(Interjection)-- I'm asking the Honourable Member from Portage la Prairie.

MR. DESJARDINS: If you can't read it's not our fault.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. We must keep to the rules of the House and I found another rule which is perhaps more strictly applicable. "62 (2) Speeches in a Committee of the Whole House must be strictly relevant to the item or clause under consideration." The item under consideration is reference of this Bill 110 to the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders. Keep to this motion.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, we are discussing a pension plan and we on this side have suggestions and we have reservations about the plan that has been proposed by the front bench and surely is it not possible to look at other experiences and other jurisdictions?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, we are discussing this plan Bill 110

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, how can I show a better plan or better ideas without comparison?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Canada Pension Plan is something quite different.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge): . . . ground that we are discussing a specific motion, which calls for the reference for this bill not to be considered at this time but to be referred to a committee. That's a very specific motion. My honourable friend will have an opportunity to present his material in one of two places, either at the committee to which the bill is referred or later on in this committee if the bill should continue to be considered here. He will have his opportunity to speak. I think the Chair is perfectly right in calling for strict observance of this rule.

MR. MOLGAT: Well. Mr. Chairman, on the point of order, isn't it correct though that in showing why it is that this particular bill that is before us, why this bill should be referred to a committee for further study, isn't the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie perfectly in order in showing the attitude of the government relative to another pension plan, and if that is their attitude on another pension plan, then surely he is perfectly relevant in showing that this should be their same attitude on this pension plan. Now I can't see that that isn't speaking directly to the motion. He is indicating for purposes of comparison the position that this government has taken on the Canada Pension Plan. Now this seems to me to be perfectly relevant because the government has taken the position on the Canada Pension Plan that it requires further study, and therefore if that's what he's talking about he's perfectly in line.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, on the point of order, I

MR. EVANS: one further remark on that regard, I was addressing myself to the point of order which is correct. I leave it to the Chair to make his ruling as to whether any honourable gentleman's remarks are relevant to the point under discussion or not.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, in addition to that, if I may Mr. Chairman, I want to know, I didn't follow the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie. but I'd like to know whether he was talking about the first, the second, the third, the fourth or the fifth revision of the Canada Pension Plan. There's been so god-darned many of them that nobody here in Canada really, even at this late date, knows what the Canada Pension Plan is, and I want to know from my honourable friend the Member for Portage la Prairie, which revision is he talking about.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, that's a very valid request on the part of the Leader of the NDP and I'm sure that my colleague will be happy to accommodate him by probably reading from every one of the plans if that's what the honourable gentleman wants.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, if I may. There may be some relevancy, if that's the proper word, between what the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie is talking about and the plans that have been brought before various sessions of the Parliament of Canada. I would like to know, in accordance with your suggestion, Mr. Chairman, what this has to do with the possibility of consideration of a Pension Plan here in the Province of Manitoba, because as far as I am concerned - on the point of order - I don't give a continental what the commitments of the Government of Manitoba may be respecting the Canada Pension Plan. What I want to hear from the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie is what he thinks regarding the Pension Plan that has been introduced to this House. I don't care, quite frankly. Mr. Chairman, what Judy LaMarsh has done in respect of Canada Pension Plan. What I want to know --(Interjection)-- as a matter of fact if we here did what Judy did insofar as -- if we followed the same practice as Judy did, Miss LaMarsh did, insofar as the House of Commons at Ottawa is concerned, we'd have had a half a dozen different plans. All I want to hear as a Member of this Assembly, is what the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie wants to suggest insofar as this plan is concerned that's being proposed, whether or not it should be referred to a committee. This is the proposition that we have before us. We don't care, and I don't care, what the Honourable Judy LaMarsh at Ottawa has to propose as far as the Canada Pension is concerned, I want to hear from my honourable friend is what he has to say. Not his girl friend, not his mother, not his sister, or his brother or his nephew - I want to know what relationship this has insofar as this plan is concerned for Manitoba.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman on the same point of order, I wonder --(Interjection)-- Oh I'm sorry.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I thought you had made a ruling earlier on in the day against repetition and my honourable friend from Radisson asked the question seven times.

I would like to say in reply to the Honourable Leader of the NDP that I am now considering on speaking about the revised final draft of the Federal Pension Plan as versus the CCMPP, that is the Conservative Cabinet Ministers Pension Plan of Manitoba - and if I may continue, I'm nearly to the end of my quotation. If I may also mention, Mr. Chairman, this afternoon the Honourable Member for St. Vital told us a very entertaining little story about the three little pigs which had nothing whatsoever to do with the subject at hand, and he was allowed to continue. I am speaking on Pension Plans.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We want to hear about the pension plan that's before the House.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, can I not make comparisons?

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I object to this calling the Minister in Ottawa by the first name of Judy and implying that she's the girl friend of my honourable friend from Portage. I think that this is a serious matter and I don't think that this should be permitted. If my friend wants to be privileged, there are other rooms that he could go - I think that there's a lodge room, and I think that we should be allowed to listen to the good advice that my honourable friend from Portage is saying. I for one am very interested in finding out more about this plan.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, on the point of order. Is my honourable friend from St. Boniface, objecting to somebody else calling her the girl friend of the Member for Portage. Is he possibly interested in the honourable lady?

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, Mr. Chairman, my honourable friend explained this afternoon what was more important than listening to my honourable friend the former Leader of the Opposition, and if he thought this was more important I would sooner be a friend of Miss LaMarsh

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) than - well I think he knows what I mean.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member from Portage la Prairie may continue but his remarks must be relevant to the Bill before us and not quotations from the other plan.

MR. JOHNSTON: I will cut short my quotations and I have one sentence if I may - one sentence to continue. This is quoting again, the Honourable the First Minister in his Throne Speech with his opinion of the Canada Pension Plan and I quote - page 225. "We can afford the Canada Pension Plan in isolation but whether we can afford it as it stands in the context of our other needs - Manitoba wants better pensions" -- and I put the words of the First Minister aside and come to speak now directly of the plan at hand. And if I may quote from a well known publication, the Winnipeg Tribune, on their remarks on the present plan under consideration, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Did you quote from that editorial already today?

MR. JOHNSTON: I didn't finish it, Mr. Chairman, it was 5:30. I think I had just finished speaking about the first twin where he had paid in a total of \$768 - no he was entitled to a life-time pension beginning at the age of 30, of \$768 a year. He lived until he was 70 and died happy for he had received a total of \$30,720 and his premiums which he paid as a young politician had been only \$1,536.00. Now the other twin stayed out of politics. Instead, at age 22 he starts a little business of his own and paid \$158 annual premiums into the Canada Pension Plan. He paid them every year until he was 65, a total of \$6,794.00. Then he received an annual pension of \$1,250.00. Like his brother, he died at 70, after having received a total pension of \$6,250.00. But it was their cousin who made the best investment. He went into politics, too, and he served eight years as a cabinet minister, defeated at age 35 and received a lifetime monthly pension of \$314.00. And by the time he died at 70, he had collected \$131,880.00. Not bad for a total premium investment of \$7,536.00. But then pensions are curious things.

Mr. Chairman, earlier in the day the Minister who introduced the bill had complained rather sadly that the figures he had given out in his introducing the bill had been used out of context by one of the newspapers and perhaps he would check these figures and if they're in order he should let us know --(Interjection)-- No. Someone is on his feet over there. The rules of the House require one to sit down. While the Minister is -- I'm glad to see I have his attention -- While I have his attention, I'll give him two more questions.

MR. CARROLL: ask a question if the member will permit. If one of the twins had been contributing to the Canada Pension Plan - and I'm only asking this because you're an authority on the subject - if one of the twins had been contributing to the Canada Pension Plan for five years and he died or became disabled, would he have a better deal or a worse deal than one who had been contributing to a pension plan under the plan that's before the House at the present time?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I don't know the answer to that question. I was going to give the Minister two more questions to answer when he took part in the debate. He doesn't need to answer them at this time, but he can make a note of them. I ask him this in all fairness, does the Minister think that this is the time to introduce a pension plan of the dimensions that we have before us with the heat tax still on? He can mark that one down and answer when he's on his feet.

I would also like to address a question to members of the backbench that they can answer when they get on their feet. Do they honestly believe that this is a good pension plan? Now if I may carry on, we heard at great length when the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources was on his feet and giving a real sales pitch for this pension plan, and he spoke about the affluent society. Well I have here an article from the Winnipeg Tribune, Wednesday, May 5th, when the Honourable Minister of Welfare has a few remarks to make about the society that we are in. And I would like to quote - and this is a direct quotation: "We don't see the poor because we are not looking or we are looking the other way, or they are tucked down the side roads or in some slums or somewhere on the fringes of respectable society said Mr. Carroll presenting the estimates and the annual report of the Welfare Department. They are lost in the national averages which continue to show satisfactory progress. As standards of living rise so does the disparity between the rich and the poor. Mr. Carroll said Winnipeg's prime trouble area for welfare is the Salter-Jarvis region. He said social welfare agencies, health authorities, children's aid societies have failed to deal with family problems in this area. A special government project.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I don't want to interrupt my honourable friend, the Member for Portage la Prairie. I wonder if you would mind stating the question that is before the House at the present time.

MR. IESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman: point of order? Well on the same point of order, you weren't questioning anything, and in the middle of a speech, in the middle of a speech he stands up, and this is the third question he's asked. I thought you were the Chairman here. If there is going to be privileges this is an important matter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order. Speeches in the Committee of the Whole House must be strictly relevant to the item or clause under consideration. Now will the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie please keep to the rules of this House. We have the other members trying to keep to the rules and you should keep to the rules too.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, what I'm asking is, what is the motion before the House at the present time?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That this committee recommend to the House that Bill No. 110, an Act respecting Payments to Members of the Legislative Assembly and Minister of the Crown upon their ceasing to be members or ministers of the Crown be not further proceeded with at this session, but be referred to the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations,

MR. PAULLEY: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie please keep to this subject. The quotation that he is now reading is irrelevant.

MR. JOHNSTON: All right, Mr. Chairman, I'll try, and if I don't, please correct me. Mr. Chairman, I have to refer to another clipping that urges more drastic action or at least suggests more drastic action than we are proposing in this resolution. And this clipping is from the front page of the Free Press and I haven't the date on it, but it says - the headline says: "May drop bill on MLA pensions. Roblin rumoured backing away." Mr. Chairman, we are not suggesting that the Honourable First Minister take this course of action, whether this was a serious thought on his part, I do not know, but we are making the simple plea that this bill be referred to a committee for study. There have been enough points brought up today to show, more than show that this bill needs further study. For example, this afternoon the point was elicited from the Minister, it wasn't volunteered, but it was brought out in a discussion that a Cabinet Minister could serve his term in Cabinet long enough to build up his pension for eight years or 16 years - in the case of 16 years he could retire with a pension of \$588.00 a month -- and then we find out through questioning only, that the same Cabinet Minister could come back in the House as a private member, sit and collect his indemnity

MR. STEINKOPF: Mr. Chairman, just a point of correction. That information is readily available if one would take the trouble to read the bill.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I'm sure that the members of this House that read the bill the first time didn't realize that a man could collect a pension of \$588.00 a month, and when the bill was first proposed this was for his lifetime, and then he could sit as a backbencher and collect as a private member. I'm sure that this -- (Interjection) --

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie has the floor.

MR. JOHNSTON: Here's what someone else is saying about this bill. Winnipeg Tribune, May 7th, and it's titled "The Wheel of Fortune", "Bill 110 was introduced into the Legislature this week with all the financial intoxication characteristic of political excursions into the pensions field. The bill suffers under the misnomer of being a pensions act. It is more like a wheel of fortune with the MLA standing on the pedal and calling the pay-off. The bill was rushed into the House on the eve of prorogation, containing clauses that offered "pensions" (and pensions are in quotation marks -- in other words this is sarcasm) from \$768.00 to \$11,000 a year payable for life upon retirement from the House. It was hastily amended Thursday. Instead of paying such pensions for life the amendment made them payable at age 55 for life, or the pensioner could choose to accept 12 consecutive annual payments upon leaving the House no matter how young he might be. This amendment underlined the haphazard provisions of the bill."

Mr. Chairman, we heard the Minister trying to get off the hook this afternoon on this one. He told us that this bill had been under study for years - I believe he said, years - and he brings in a bill that is amended within two days, and a major amendment at that. As a matter of fact I believe it took off at least half of the benefits that could have accrued had the bill gone through unchallenged. I continue: "This amendment underlined the haphazard provisions of the bill. A Cabinet Minister, for instance, who might easily have qualified for \$7,000 pension at age 50, suddenly had \$35,000 subtracted from his gross pension income. A humble MLA with 15 years in the House who expected a pension of \$1,440 a year starting at age 50,

MR. JOHNSTON cont'd.) will now have to wait until he's 55 before he collects. That amendment cost him about \$7,000 in his gross take. The taxpayer however, has no reason to be elated by the government's quick decision to introduce these economies. There is still more reward in Bill 110 for politicians than any private individual is likely to encounter in his life. In addition to its bountiful payouts, Bill 110 fails in its basic purpose which was to help MLAs to re-establish themselves in private business should they have the misfortune of being defeated after eight years in the House. It was argued that an MLA having dedicated himself to public service finds it difficult to get back into the swing of things. Bill 110 would give this MLA a pension of \$64.00 a month for eight years service. If he served less than eight years he would receive back his \$192.00 yearly premiums. Certainly Bill 110 wouldn't put many tired MLAs back on their feet at those rates, but the accumulative effect of Bill 110 covering all MLAs and Cabinet Ministers has great rewards for those who stay in the House for long periods. A long-term professional politician will make a killing as indicated by these examples. A Cabinet Minister leaving the House after 15 years service at age 55 will receive an annual lifetime pension of \$7,000.00. For this he will have paid in premiums a total of \$14,130.00. In contrast to this, a private individual to build up a similar pension at annuity rates would need to invest \$92,375.00. An MLA leaving the House at age 55 after 15 years service would receive an annual lifetime pension of \$1,440.00. His total premium to get that pension would be \$2,880.00. A private person to build a similar annuity payable at 55 for life would need to invest \$18,828.00. We can no longer say that politics don't pay." Mr. Chairman, I submit that last statement is the understatement of the year; and the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources tries to tell us otherwise.

Mr. Chairman, I know some of the members are saying, well, what is the point of reading this, what is the point of this, because after all when you fellows get through talking we're going to ram this bill through. Well, Mr. Chairman, I would like, if I have your permission, to turn to the Ontario legislation in this regard. Revised statutes of Ontario 1960, and it has to do with the pensions for Cabinet Ministers and members of their parliament. To begin with, one startling difference between the Ontario pension bill and the Manitoba pension act is that Cabinet Ministers in Ontario receive pension based only on their salary and not on their indemnity, and they have a rider, a stricture there, that the maximum payable to a Cabinet Minister is 50 percent of his salary. Now if this were applied to the Manitoba situation where the Cabinet Minister's salary is \$12,500, his indemnity is \$3,200 - and we don't count his other \$1,600 or we don't count his car or his allowances - instead of basing his pension on 12.5 plus 32 which is 15,700, and in Manitoba the maximum pension available is 70 percent or in the neighbourhood of \$11,000 a year. In Ontario the maximum pension available to a Cabinet Minister is 50 percent of his salary. This is all. Now I do not know what the salary of an Ontario Cabinet Minister is so I can't equate that; but if it were Manitoba the maximum pension available to a Manitoba Cabinet Minister would be half of 12,500. In other words, it would be 6,250. Now this is a startling difference.

We were told earlier in the debates when the Ministers were making their explanations that this plan was quite a bit more modest than plans in other jurisdictions. I haven't had the time to check all jurisdictions in this regard, but I do have before me the Ontario one, and I will just confine my remarks to a comparison. The Ontario plan likewise consists of a six percent contribution. In the case of a minister it's based on his salary. In the case of a member it's based on his indemnity. There is one difference where a member down there in Ontario gets an annual allowance equal to 75 percent of total contributions -- and if I may remark on the difference of the titles of the bills, the Ontario one is called The Retirement Allowances Act and ours - what is the name of ours - An Act respecting payments -- oh, I thought it was a pension plan. Pardon me. It's payments all right.

To be eligible in Ontario members or Cabinet Ministers must have ten or more years of service. Now even at first look this tells something. There can be no fooling around with, calling extra sessions or calling two sessions in a year and building up the eight sessions that are needed which is under our plan, the proposed plan here. It spells it out in Ontario. To be eligible a member must have ten or more years of service and there cannot be any monkeying with that. And it starts at age 55. There's no ands, ifs or buts. It can't start at any other age. It starts at age 55.

Another difference that is quite lacking in the plan here, this pension or allowances payment in Ontario will not be paid while a member is serving in the assembly, yet here we have a case where a Cabinet Minister can come back perhaps in opposition or perhaps retire from

(MR. JOHNSTON cont'd.) the cabinet and go to the back bench, he can come back into this House and draw a big fat pension and still draw his indemnity. This is specifically guarded against in the Ontario legislation. This cannot happen there. Further to that, and I'll quote directly out of the Act: "An allowance under Section 6 shall be suspended while a person is entitled thereto (a) is a member of the Assembly, the House of Commons of Canada or the Senate of Canada." There's no such restrictions in the proposed bill before us here, Mr. Chairman. This hasn't been considered apparently, or if it has been considered, we have not had an explanation about it. "(b) is employed in the public service of Ontario". Mr. Chairman, is it fair for someone to retire out of this House at a pension anywhere from \$314.00 a month up to \$900.00 a month? Is it fair to have someone drawing this kind of money from the public purse - and don't say it's a self-supporting plan because we know it isn't. But is it fair for a person like this to go onto the public payroll of the same jurisdiction and start drawing money again? This can happen under the Manitoba proposal. Some of the honourable front benchers over there who are lawyers and who have good connections in their party can conceivably be appointed judges and get a pension from this House and a full judge's salary. There's all kinds of intriguing possibilities where they could pick up a little extra income, still from the taxpayers, still from the public purse. "(c) holds office in any kind the remuneration for which is paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund". So what does this mean, Mr. Chairman? This means that if a government is so minded they can't appoint their political cronies and friends to boards, commissions or any of the various places there are to pick up three or four or five thousand dollars sitting on a board that maybe meet once or twice a week. We know now that these are used as unofficial pension plans, but this is a little bit too much to pile one on top of the other. Surely it's not too much to ask that if a member out of this House is defeated or retires and serves on one of these boards he certainly shouldn't be getting a pension as well as a stipend for serving on that board. Ontario seem to think that this is a correct procedure to follow. "(d) is an officer, member or employee of a Crown agency as defined in The Crown Agency Act." Now I haven't taken the trouble to look up their Crown Agency Act, but I presume that still closes the loopholes for political jobs when you're drawing a pension.

There are also - well, I'll quote part of the Act that has to do with the ministers' salaries. "Notwithstanding anything in subsection (1), contributions under this section shall not be deducted from the salary of a minister after the total amount contributed by him is sufficient to provide an allowance equal to one-half the annual salary of a minister having charge of a department". Another excerpt from this Act - Section 6, and it's to do with a member: "A member who has contributed in respect of ten or more years of service and who has attained the age of 55 years is entitled to an annual allowance during his lifetime upon ceasing to be a member". Section 3: "The amount of a person's annual allowance under this section shall be an amount equal to 75 percent of the total of his contributions as a member, but the amount of his allowance shall not exceed the amount of his indemnity".

There are other spheres that have not been covered in the proposed bill before us. For instance, when a member dies, if he dies before his pension goes into effect, I believe the bill gives provision for returning the money. The Ontario Act gives some concern for the widow or the members of the family who may be left; so when one of their members or one of their Cabinet Ministers go onto a pension and dies while he is on the pension there is provision made for half of whatever the allowance was to go to the widow. There's no mention made of this here. I just remark on this.

So, Mr. Chairman, I'm sure if any of the honourable members of the front bench have been listening - and I know they're trying very hard to close their ears - but if they've been listening, they will know in their hearts that there are many errors of omission and commission in this present bill, and I'm hoping that they will have the broadmindedness and the gumption to let this bill go to the committee as suggested in this motion so that it can be sorted out. I for one am not going back to my constituency when this House prorogues and have to say that I had any part in passing legislation that is based on the income, based on the economy of Manitoba and pays out such munificent benefits as we're paying to -- and I state it again to the front bench of this House, I'd be very interested to hear some of the back benchers over there get up and defend this proposition. I'd be very interested to hear them, any one of them, to get up and give their views on this. Tell us what they think. Is this a good bill. I would certainly like to hear from them, Mr. Chairman.

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): I'd be very pleased to comply with the honourable gentleman's request. And I think I'd like to bring back a little more practical view of this

(MR. LISSAMAN cont'd.) . . . pension. We've heard the most extravagant claims all based upon the ultimate. Now I think that you compare the behaviour to a modern automobile. Any one of the larger standard makes will probably travel in excess of 100 miles an hour, but very rarely do we drive at 100 miles an hour. In fact there are speed limits to prevent us from driving at that speed. Now I suggest to honourable members here that there are very, just as rigid regulations imposed upon this and that is the natural casualty rate of this House. By a quick count before I got up, I believe that I am about the eighth oldest member in the House, and I came in in 1952, so that means in 14 years there are only eight out of 57 still here in this House. So it gives you an idea of how rare that occasion is going to be that these doomsters see in everyone staying here until we become graybeards and all collecting huge sums of money. I think we need a proper look at this thing.

Now I'd like to touch on one other point that may bring us back to a little more realistic view of the situation. I think all members, Mr. Chairman, would agree that one of the things we value very highly in this country is our judicial system. One of the aims when we consider salaries of judges and so on is to make these people relatively independent of influence and we try to provide that they are financially independent. And when we appoint people to boards, and I suggest to Cabinet, certainly if they don't divest themselves of business interests they certainly must not deal in that particular line of business, and I know all members here engaged in business have experienced that rule of this House.

Now think of this province in relation to this relevancy that I'm trying to bring back here to this House. There's a million people roughly in this province. There are 57 members out of that million, and good heavens we hear about sales taxes and everything. What is this cost going to be. Are the honourable members in the Liberal Party trying to feed the idea that it's going to take the whole fuel tax or something of this nature to take care of 57 members out of a million people? I don't think anyone would call a pension starting off at around \$65.00 any great burden upon the million people of this province, and the chances of them getting a very great percentage are are very remote, as I pointed out before, because the percentage is only increased by three percent a year. In 15 years you've only arrived at 45 percent of a pension, and yet look back at the casualty list of this House in a period of 15 years. Let's look at this thing in a proper perspective, gentlemen.

Now then you can refine this argument still further. You think the pensions payable to Cabinet Ministers, who I suggest should be regarded as important in my opinion, as judges, in respect to being independent and in circumstances such that they would not be influenced by money. We in Canada look upon our record - certainly there are slips once in a while - but we look upon our record of political men in this country with the highest pride, and I think that members who serve in this Cabinet, 12 to 14 men probably at a time out of a million people. This is no great burden, the pension that has been suggested for a Cabinet Minister to assure that independence, and I think anything that we do that promotes the security of a private member or a Cabinet Minister is supporting one of the prime objects we are seeking to attain in our Houses of Parliament, and that is independence and the freedom and the right to be independent, and when people, honourable members of this committee, go to all these extremes, cite old graybeards sitting here all their lives.

Mr. Chairman, I never heard such rank stupidity in all my life, because the type of men who have appealed to the voters for as many years as the Member of Lakeside are very very rare occasions in this country, very rare, and the honourable member can take a great deal of pride in this, I am sure. Not too many members are elected and re-elected and re-elected under our system. The chances of reaching those huge percentages and these huge figures and how much money they're going to amass are dreams, wild dreams, and I think honourable members in the Liberal Party should get back to a little relevancy of the situation and talk in practical terms, not taking the utmost. They're sure racing down the highway at a hundred miles an hour.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, I listened with interest to the Member for Brandon and he spoke of the high salaries paid to the judges so they could maintain their independence, but I fail to see how this is relevant to Cabinet Ministers remaining independent once they've left the government. Why are they required to remain independent - independent from what? -- (Interjection) -- But the judges are paid -- judges are in an occupation and are paid to do a job, and they're paid that amount so they can remain independent from influence.

MR. LISSAMAN: We pension them off too.

MR. GUTTORMSON: This is true, but they're pensioned off after they're 75 years old. Now, I'm not opposed to the

MR. CARROLL: I wonder if the honourable member would permit a question.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Yes.

MR. CARROLL: Can you tell us how much a judge gets when he retires and how much he contributes toward that pension?

MR. GUTTORMSON: No, I'm sorry I can't. I do know that they're pensioned off at 75, but they work till they're 75. A Cabinet Minister might work for eight years and then he's automatically eligible for a pension. There's quite a difference. Now I don't disagree with the principle of pensions, but my objection is to the manner that it was brought in. I think the members should take heed of what I'm going to tell them how the people outside feel.

Now in introducing this pension plan, it is so designed that any member who is elected who came into the present administration in 1958 is eligible. Now this is too obvious that it's for the members in this House - all of them - or virtually all of them. I'd like to suggest that if they're going to consider a pension plan that it should be - well 15 years or more. If this type of plan goes into effect at this time it can be projected ahead and those members who remain in the House for that period of time or those that are in the House at this time who are sitting here now and have served that length of time, they would qualify. Surely we shouldn't put in a plan that'll make it eligible after only eight years, because it's so obvious that the government has brought it in, and designed this plan to help only those people that came in in 1958. This is what I -- I think this government is making a grave error.

I'll admit that the Minister introducing the bill said that the government had studied this for several years. Now I'm not questioning him, but if it took the government several years to study the plan that's brought in, it raises some doubts with me, because already after we raised some objections they're bringing in an amendment; and by the same token that the government took several years, surely the members of the opposition are entitled to some time to examine the bill.

And speaking of time - I thought I had read the bill carefully, but it wasn't until the member for Portage la Prairie spoke tonight that I realized that a Cabinet Minister was entitled to collect a pension while a member of this House. Now this is all new to me. and if it hadn't been for the Member for Portage la Prairie I wouldn't have been aware of this, and I wonder how many other members were aware of this. Surely this is wrong, that a member sitting in this House is eligible to collect a pension as a member of this House. I haven't studied all pension plans in Canada - that is on a government level - but those that I have seen, an ex-member isn't entitled to collect a pension if he's appointed as a judge or to a government board or a senator. Surely provisions like this should be in the bill.

Doing some rough calculations, I wonder if the members realize that by taking part in this plan the members are eligible for 500 percent return on their money. Now take the case of the Premier just as a case in point. Based on an eight-year period and on the salary that he receives at the present time, he would pay into the plan \$1,062 a year; and on an eight-year basis he would contribute \$8,496.00. Then if he left the House and started taking money from the pension plan, he would recover all his money within two years.

Well the point I'm making is no matter how much you contribute, whether you contribute for eight years or 30 years, you get your money all back in two years. There's no risk involved at all. Now if a private member contributes \$192.00 a year, on a basis of eight years he would contribute something in the neighbourhood of \$1,500, and he would receive all his contributions once he started collecting the pension in two years. Therefore he's got ten years to reap the rest of his money if he takes it before age 55.

I feel that the government should give this matter some consideration. Now if they're very anxious to implement this legislation before the next election, they still have another year to do it. There's no member of this House going to suffer, because the members that came in 1959 - 1958 and '59 are going to qualify anyway till after 1966. so I suggest that there is no urgency in the legislation. It can be studied and, as I say, the point brought out by the Member for Portage la Prairie was the most revealing one to me. I just didn't realize it and, as I say, I thought I had studied the bill. I would suggest that the Minister give it every consideration and study this bill. If he wishes to put it through there are many important amendments that must be put into it because, as it stands, it's ridiculous to think that members can collect after eight years. If members are going to collect, I think they should serve a reasonable amount of time. 12 or 15 years and perhaps longer, but not eight years. It's so obvious that

(MR. GUTTORMSON cont'd.) . . . it was designed for the members of this House so that they'll all qualify.

The Minister introducing the bill said -- he did qualify, he said it would cost about \$20,000 a year. I would like to point out that if just six Cabinet Ministers go on the pension plan it's in the neighbourhood of \$20,000, so it's obvious that his calculations on what it's going to cost the province are very conservative because it's obvious that the figure is going to be substantially more than that.

So I would urge the Minister to take heed and withdraw the bill and present it again after he's had a chance to see the error of his ways, because there are many changes necessary in this bill before I or any of my group can accept it.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Honourable Member for St. George would permit a question?

MR. GUTTORMSON: Yes.

MR. PAULLEY: Can he visualize at any time in the history of the Legislative Assemblies of the Province of Manitoba when it might be possible to introduce a bill respecting pensions that will not affect some member of the Legislature?

MR. GUTTORMSON: I'm sorry, I'm not quite sure I follow you. Would you ask it again, please?

MR. PAULLEY: Yes certainly, Mr. Chairman. The Honourable Member for St. George in his discourse indicated that the pension plan was tailored because of the fact that some members are now sitting in the Assembly that might obtain some benefits from it, and I ask my honourable friend, can he visualize - either now or any other time - when it might be possible to introduce a pension plan which will not affect some sitting member of the Legislature. My honourable friend emphasized in my opinion that particular point, so I ask him, can he visualize any circumstances in the Legislature, in the light of past history, when a pension plan might be introduced into this House which does not affect some member or members of this Assembly?

MR. GUTTORMSON: Yes, that's very easy to do, but I'm not suggesting that type of plan. I'm suggesting that a longer period of time -- (Interjection) -- Yes I can, don't get carried away. If we implement a plan that becomes effective after the next election and you serve an X number of years after that date, that means that nobody sitting in this House is eligible -- (Interjection) -- Absolutely.

MR. PAULLEY: But somebody is going to get re-elected.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Sure that's true, I'm sure that's the case, but they don't qualify until they get re-elected.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, we have a motion in front of us that I think is very important. The motion is quite simple. The motion states that this should go to committee. I think that for the first time - and I think he tried his best to answer - the Honourable Member from Brandon tried to answer.

Now he said two things. Well he said more than two things, but two things that I want to refer to. He said, well we will go a hundred miles an hour. He said there's speed limits. And he said it will not take the full heat tax to pay for this. He's right on both counts. What if we won in Manitoba speeds at a 100 miles an hour, but they have speed limits. They have speed limits, and this is what I want to see. I want to see speed limits.

I think I said that I probably would go for the principle of a pension if this is all we discuss. I would be ready to discuss this now. Then the step number 2, the same as I would do or anybody else would do in their business, and I think most of us would agree on this. There would be a few the Honourable Member for Lakeside said that he would oppose it. Well the odd one might also. There would be no battle; there would be no name-calling. There's no reason for that. We would establish a pension.

The next step would be when should we start collecting. That's the next step. There might be a battle there. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture is not here. He asked me yesterday with a big smile, would I collect. I probably will claim if I ever qualify, but I'll tell you this, I never will and I'm myself now, I never will while there's a tax on heat in this province. This is not ridiculous and this is not childish and this is not being gloomy because I say to the Honourable Member from Brandon it is true that it doesn't take all this money, but I say to him, what would you think of a father who is going out to a ball game with his son and the son wants his supper and he says "no", and then he's going to pull out a hot dog -- buy a hot dog and a chocolate bar. Well it's the same thing. Oh, you can

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) laugh all you want, but this is the same thing. How can we justify - how can we justify

MR. KEITH ALEXANDER (Roblin): Who took your chocolate bar?

MR. DESJARDINS: Well it isn't you. But how can we justify doing that, putting a tax on -- laugh all you want -- laugh all you want -- and the next election or now or any time, go on a platform and at that meeting say -- now that you invited me, I'll be there -- I'll tell them what they think, what they think of putting the heat tax on them, on the poor people. Those from Churchill they don't pay as much because they burn twigs, but the other people -- although they sent a long telegram to tell us that they didn't go for that. We can say, and if you're man enough to say it on a platform and say, "Yes, I'm the one that imposed that tax," he said with a big smile -- the same smile that the honourable member has now-- he can tell them, "I'm the one that imposed this tax on you and I'm the one that voted this pension for myself."

The Minister of Mines and Natural Resources can go a step further. He'll say, "I'm the one, when I'm about 43 or so" -- well now there's been an amendment but I'll come back to this' -- "I'm the one that can collect \$588.00 a month." Now let's be sincere, is there any one of you here that want to do that? Is there any one of you that will have the courage to do that? Unless you don't care, unless you don't care about the people anymore, unless you have no thought of coming back into this House. This is addressed mostly - not at the rest of these people, the back benchers, because you agree with me, you know that I'm right and you won't speak up - but this is to my friends in front of me mostly. My words are addressed at them.

I did not criticize the principle of pension and I'm not criticizing that, except at the time, but I am criticizing that. I want that speed limit. I want to see that speed limit. Why can't we have something with a maximum for a Cabinet Minister of \$250.00 or \$300.00? Why? Why nine hundred and something dollars a month for Cabinet Ministers? Nobody's going to tell me that they're that important and that they're doing that good a job - no one. We threw that one out the window this afternoon, that it was to get better people.

Then we were told about this plan in Ottawa, this great plan that they had and how awful it was. He was careful to call it the Pearson plan and I don't care about the Pearson plan. I don't care what plan it is. If it's unfair, it's unfair. No man, Mr. Chairman --(Interjection)--I'll wait for my answers after and I'll try to answer all the questions all night until 12 o'clock or 1:00 o'clock, I don't care. I want to say to the honourable member that it's the speed limit that we want. Thanks very much, but I said a chocolate bar, I didn't say a bag of candy. And a hot dog. This reminds me of the sucker. Is it in order to throw it back at them? They need it more than I do.

MR. PAULLEY: No, it's not in order.

MR. DESJARDINS: All right. Is it in order if I go across and give it to my MLA instead of his pension?

MR. PAULLEY: The best MLA

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, the best MLA -- and he's still not worth no \$588.00 a month. I would like to see -- you don't have to put up with me at all. You don't have to put up with me at all.

MR. PAULLEY: Move out.

MR. DESJARDINS: I don't have to move out. You're the one that doesn't want to put up with me. You don't elect me; I elect you.

MR. PAULLEY: Oh no. You moved into my constituency while I was the MLA.

MR. DESJARDINS: That's right, but you won't be now that I am in there.

MR. PAULLEY: Is that a challenge? You'll be my opponent?

MR. DESJARDINS: You had the white flag last year when I suggested that.

MR. PAULLEY: Oh no I didn't.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, is he in order? I'm talking about the plan here, the Manitoba plan, the Conservative

MR. PAULLEY: Well you wanted to change the subject.

MR. DESJARDINS: All right then, let's get back to something serious. I'm talking about the \$250.00 or \$300.00. I'll go for that - I'll go for that - and I would go for a maximum of \$100.00 or \$150.00 for the members, but not the way we have now and not while we're depriving the people of Manitoba, and while we tell the people of Manitoba, like the Honourable Member for St. Vital said in his resolution and all the members voted unanimously, that it was a heat tax or a sales tax, and you know what that sales tax is. No, they can't have that separate but we'll have the chocolate bar and we'll have the hot dog -- (Interjection) -- No, they get peanuts sometimes.

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.)

I think this is serious, Mr. Chairman. They said, and I agree with them that it's not going to take all that money, but the principle do that. Can we do that? Can we throw it right back in their face, those poor people who have a little bit of pride and who do not want to be on relief or on welfare. I'm not saying that all the people of Manitoba are like that, but there are some that are trying to keep their dignity. They don't want - they don't want any of this welfare - and those are the people that are affected by that. Those are the people that are paying this tax on heat, and I don't think it's fair to laugh at them when they're doing that and get out of here with \$588.00 in their pockets; and this is not so far-fetched. The maximum is \$970.00.

I've got something here -- every time I stand up I find something else. Maybe I can't read, but this afternoon I was flabbergasted for I was told that there are two different things. They can have a pension as a Cabinet Minister, and as my honourable friend said, well there's those days it's not going to be so tiresome, he can come and listen and sleep in the back seat and still get this pension of the Cabinet Minister. He can still get this pension of a Cabinet Minister. Well if this is the case I've got some thing here that is feasible. I'll say to the Honourable Member of Brandon that you won't find this every day; and it's not every single person that drives a hundred miles an hour, but there are the odd ones and this is possible.

First of all, do you know that the Leader of the Opposition gets altogether? -- \$9,200 a year. The Speaker gets \$12,800; a Minister gets \$15,700; and an MLA get 32. Now the maximum for the Leader, he can go up to \$6,440 -- (Interjection) -- 96? Oh no, but I'm adding - isn't that altogether? -- (Interjection) -- Oh, well I made a mistake on the Speaker. I've got 12.8; that's supposed to be 96 and I added on. All right. So the Speaker's maximum would be less than that. The Minister's maximum is 10,990 and an MLA 2,240. Now I want to say right now that this mistake - I can't change my figures right now so I'm a little off - but at the old figures -- (Interjection) -- Well, there's the preacher, real happy. I wonder if he'll preach and be so happy at next election time. -- (Interjection) -- Not going to run again? That's why he wants the pension now.

Well, Mr. Chairman, you can have a person who is elected to the House first as a leader of a party at age 30. He can spend seven years or eight sessions as a leader and he will get \$129.00 a month for 12 years after that. Now he stays in this House. Then at that time after seven years he comes on the other side and he's a Minister - that's not far-fetched. I think if he's a Leader of the Opposition he's usually a Minister, and he can be a Minister for ten years or eleven sessions - that's not too difficult - and he's a Minister at 37, let's say to 47, and he can collect \$431.00 from age 47 to 59 - for 12 years - and then very easily he can become the Speaker.

Now this is where I want to make sure -- I got this mistake but it's not very much. But anyway, he can collect, he can be the Speaker for eight years and nine sessions and he can collect 288, or let's say 275 or 200, from age 55 on for the rest of his life because he's 55, and by then he can quit at age 55. He's been there 25 years. He's paid as an MLA and he gets \$186.00 a month for the rest of his life as an MLA. Now what does that mean?

As I say, this doesn't happen every day but this can happen. This young fellow at 37 -- from 37 to 47 - that's his age - he receives \$129.00 a month. He is still getting besides that a salary of \$15,700.00. He is still receiving that. You can see now there's something wrong again. Why can this man be able to collect while he's still in this House? He gets \$15,700 - if the wages aren't up by then - and he gets \$129.00 a month, a free car, free-loading and all that stuff. From 47 to 55 he gets \$431.00 - 47 to 55 - and for part of that he's still a Cabinet Minister and then he's still the Speaker; he still gets the salaries, these big salaries.

At 55 he quits. If the right government is on there, he's done a lot of sacrifices. This man has really worked for the people so they shove him up to Senate and he gets \$15,000 a year when he goes to Ottawa in the federal field, and he gets between the age of 55 and 59, \$906.00 a month. -- (Interjection) -- When he's up to senate, yes. -- (Interjection) -- Oh well, that again, you'll have to wait until you're in Ottawa and work for that. Now you're working for the pension. Remember that. At 59, at age 59 for the rest of his life he gets \$474.00, and he can still be at the senate and he can still be in Ottawa, and he can have his fingers in all kinds of pots by then.

Well that man received, for ten years he's received \$15,480, besides his salary from age 47 to 55, \$41,376; 55 to 59, \$43,488; and from 59, let's say he only lives till 70 - I'll come down a bit - \$62,568. He's put in \$23,280. He's had a salary as an MLA all these years for 25

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) years. Even while collecting his pension as a leader, he's got the salary of a Minister and all that goes with it; and then after that he got the salary of a Speaker.

I know it's not everybody that drives a hundred miles an hour but it's possible, and it wouldn't take that much to send this thing to committee. What's another year? I know people that waited for 75 years, and some people yesterday voted to send it to committee. So this is something else. What's another year? This is not the end of the world. We're not going to defeat the purpose. Obviously the majority of people here are in favour of the principle of a pension so it's not the end of the world, and I don't think too many of us decide that we're going to quit all of a sudden.

I think that we can wait another year unless there's an election. Well is the government - are the members of the Cabinet that panicky? Are they that much afraid that they've got to ram it through, steam roll it now? I know that what I've said is not going to happen to every member of this House, but I want to be able to go to committee and study this. I want to be able to put on the brakes, to put on a governor, to put some certain speed limit, and I want us to be able to get this darn heating tax or tax on heating fuel away from the people. In other words, give them their sucker before we take our chocolate bar and our hot dog. I think that this is the least that we could do.

The NDPs don't have to fear at all. We are for the principle. I am. The majority in this House are for this principle, but let's send this in committee and let's study it with a little bit of intelligence. The Honourable Minister who was asked two questions by the Honourable Member of St. George and my honourable friend from Portage la Prairie said I cannot answer these questions and with a big smile he sat down. That's right. Too many questions can not be answered and we want to send it in committee.

I don't buy this, the Honourable Minister pushing this bill through. I don't know where he is now. I've looked all over the place. I don't -- oh, there he is. I don't buy this, that if today wasn't Saturday I'd get the answer, but vote on it today. I don't buy that. I want to see figures. I bet that if I made a phone call on Monday, before the end of the week or before two days we'll have so many people here coming here and offer us plans, then we will look. They'll say, "Well all right, if 75 percent of you people want to take this, this is what we'll offer." And there won't be any free-loading, no free rides. We'll pay for what we want, for what we can get, and we will have a decent pension.

It's the way that this is being railroaded now. It's the way the last day - and I don't buy that either - it's the last day, because this is just finished now, we're finished right now. We've been working on it for two years or three years and we've just finished on the 3rd of May. Well the Lieutenant-Governor is waiting in the hall to finish this session like he was yesterday and today. I don't buy that. I don't buy that at all.

Why the first day, just because you saw some cards and it brought - I fell on this just by accident trying to do my homework and looking at the bill - and I'm not too smart at reading these things usually - and I started and started and started all over again, and I always come up with the same figures and it was shocking. I wanted everybody to see it and that's why I brought these cards and I showed you.

The next day we had a major amendment. You mean you didn't see that before? The people that calculated this did not see this before, and they call themselves businessmen? My goodness, if this is the case, do those people deserve \$588.00 or \$950.00 a month pension? -- (Interjection) -- I didn't hear that, but maybe you'll have a chance later on.

This is not a laughing matter, Mr. Chairman. This is very serious. -- (Interjection) -- Well, I know. I know. The Honourable Minister said, "I wish he'd hurry up." I know, but this is the only chance that I have to work to try to keep my responsibility. I can't steamroll this - we can't steamroll that because we haven't got a majority here. We can only study the facts; we can only implore you to send it to committee. It's not the end of the world. I'm even ready to have a vote right now on the principle of a pension -- (Interjection) All right, hear hear! Do you understand what I'm saying, that we'll have a vote on the principle and leave it at that? Oh no. You've got to have it in your pocket, then you'll be happy.

Well, I can't see why an important thing like this -- the First Minister hasn't taken part in this debate at all. The Leader of this House - the Leader of this House hasn't even been here the full day on a thing like this -- (Interjection) -- He's not the Leader of this House and this is not his business -- (Interjection) -- Who? Who dropped dead? -- (Interjection) -- Oh, I'm sorry, he dropped in for two minutes twice, once this morning, once this afternoon I'm

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) ... told. -- (Interjection) -- It might be the same speech but you're pretty dense out there if you can't catch on by now that this is wrong, that this is callous, that this is cruel, that this is not fair. -- (Interjection) -- Well no, I want the First Minister to hear wherever he's at. -- (Interjection) -- Well, that's for you to hear a second time. Maybe you'll understand.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a thing to play with, and if we're all taking our time, the time allotted to us to speak, it is because we find it important, and you tell me if this is not the democratic way of doing things. If you're going to railroad it through, we want to show that you're wrong. Definitely. --(Interjection)-- Oh yes, there's been a lot of complaining, there's been a lot of -- everybody thought this was a carnival attitude. Everybody's very happy, smiling and so on. --(Interjection)-- They're not fine stories, they're sad stories, to see people like you, people who could just -- well I was going to say something that --(Interjection) -- I'm talking about the plan. What do you want me to do? Tell you what you can do with that \$588 if that's what you love? Do you want me to throw you the bills so you can feel them with your greedy little fingers? Is that what you want? --(Interjection)-- I'm talking about the bill. I'm talking about the bill. I'm talking about what it's going to do --(Interjection)-- Who's yelling "Order" - you, Mr. Chairman, or --(Interjection)-- Mr. Chairman, I guess he's trying to qualify as the deputy speaker, but there's no allowance in the Act for that, for a pension on that.

MR. PAULLEY: It's fortunate for you I'm not the Speaker.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I think that we should stop this nonsense. --(Interjection)-- I wish that could be in Hansard -- maybe I should mention what I mean -- this clapping. In other words, let's railroad it through. That will go in Hansard. What are you clapping for? --(Interjection)-- That's right, I said this nonsense. Well what are you clapping for? --(Interjection)-- Oh, you're clapping for me? Well all right, I'll speak a little longer. I've got some cards to show and all that. They're clapping for me so I thought maybe they were enjoying it and I've got a few other things I can say.

Mr. Chairman, I said --(interjection)-- that's right, it's time I started. I tried to tell them, to show them what I meant, that it's a hundred miles an hour driving by these regulations; I tried to show them what a person can collect - and, that's all it is - collect; I tried to show the freeloading of the members of this House; I tried to show the cruelty of putting a heat tax amongst other taxes while the Ministers are feathering their own bed; and they call this nonsense. Well I'm not too intelligent and this is the best that I can do.

I was very serious and very sincere, and I still am when I say; let's have a vote on the question of this principle and let's leave it there. Where would you -- Oh no, my honourable friend shakes his head, this is impossible. I'd like to know why it's impossible. Nobody has answered this. Why? Why? Is there a deadline to meet? Next year or in a year it won't be good enough? What's going to happen? What's going to happen in one year? This intrigues me. I'd like to know what's going on, why we have to railroad it through, steamroll it through this year at this session, the last day of the session. I'd like to know that.

Well, Mr. Chairman, it looks as if there's not too much - - it looks like these members have made up their mind that this is what they want. They don't want to send it to Committee; they don't want us to discuss the principle of the pension by itself; they don't want us to look at the welfare of the people of Manitoba; the First Minister doesn't want to take part in this; the Minister that - it's just rumours of course, but I understand the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources is really pushing this - and he hasn't taken part in this debate either. --(Interjection)-- Yes, I hear that from some of the backbenchers.

Mr. Chairman, do you mean to tell me that you were the only one - and I think it's only fair that I mention this because I give you more credit - that you're the only one that can see that this is wrong, that you spoke the way you did - and certainly I don't think anybody can accuse you of playing politics - you spoke the way you did, you brought in the idea of this tax, of this unfair tax -- it's not the tax, I mean this pension -- do you mean to tell me that the only one, that all the rest of the members of your caucus has accepted this?

Well then I say if this is the case, if the rest of the people are sold on this idea, I say that then definitely you should go to the people on this issue. This might not be the end of the world, it's not the most important issue, but your attitude is. If you cared about the people of Manitoba -- if you just want to place your greedy little fingers on this money, if this is all you're interested in

MR. GROVES: wants to keep talking for the next two hours that's all right with

(MR. GROVES cont'd) me, but he's not going to accuse me or anybody else on this side of having greedy little fingers, so I would suggest to him that he keep his remarks in order.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, you've heard about the three little pigs. I'm talking about greedy fingers and I think that's probably a lot closer than anybody else, because this is the only way I see it; this is the only way many people of Manitoba are going to see it. I think that it's fair to say that if people that are not prepared, that something that they agreed was ready just at the very end, and people have come in in this House at the last day to try and railroad this through and make a major amendment on the next day, well I'll let the people of Manitoba decide if you have greedy little fingers or not.

MR. GROVES: I suggest that the honourable member do, because when he heard the story about the three little pigs this afternoon, he heard no reference to any person on that side of the House.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I don't think that too many people consult me. I don't think that the people of Manitoba will think that this is too far-fetched when I'm talking about people that are too cautious to study a plan like this. The Minister of Welfare for the last 15 minutes, as soon as I say let's have a vote on its principle, he's like this; and when I say let's wait for a year, he's like that. --(Interjection)-- I think that I'm pretty safe. If it's not parliamentary, if I broke the rules that way, I'll do like the Honourable the First Minister of this House said at one time, "Maybe I shouldn't say this," but when I think that something -- I don't have to worry about being parliamentary on that respect.

If this is the case, if we're so sure of this, I repeat, I would like to see this government go to the people of Manitoba because this is the crowning bill of all that's been happening these last few years, of mismanagement, of wasting of money, of higher taxes, of its cost. This is what we've seen. This is what we've seen all along, and I think that on the whole record -- I think we had an election in 1959 and then right back in '62 -- and what did we go on? On the record of this government. We had to go on then on the record of this government. The end of '59 to '60, '61, '62 - three years. This is three years now.

I think the people of Manitoba would like to see an election called on the record of the government, and I think that if they don't want to do anything on this bill, let's railroad it through, but let's get an election right now. Let's find out. I don't know if there's a way that you can undo any legislation of this kind. If this passes through, as far as I'm concerned this is what I'm going to preach, because this is not just going to be the goodbye of some of the members of the Cabinet, they're going to qualify for this and be set up - by themselves - set up with a pension for the rest of their lives.

Now we were told that you have to be independent, and that the only way to independence is money - a good pension if you want to make a person independent. Now I don't subscribe to this either. If the people can do what they do for a few dollars, isn't it natural - and I'm not talking about all the people of all parties now - isn't it natural that there will be this ambition, this great ambition, not to serve but to qualify for a pension. Isn't it the case that if you can figure that for this kind of a deal, that you can't duplicate this anywhere, isn't it normal to expect that there will be a lot of people that will be in there just for the money? You'll be defeating the purpose that you're trying to establish now. I think that a lot of people would certainly want to put in eight years, if they can get in as a Cabinet Minister, eight years and get \$315.00 a month for the rest of their life from age 55.

I think the Honourable Member for Brandon is the one that brought this up and I think that he should be - and I think he is in all the dealings that I've had with him in this House - I think that he has to be fair and recognize that this is so, in many cases that this will be so. You don't think that this is possible?

MR. LISSAMAN: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the honourable member a question? I think that you're quite a hockey player, or used to be, and quite a hockey fan.

MR. DESJARDINS: No, I wasn't.

MR. LISSAMAN: Wouldn't you agree that to get into the National League for example, where a tremendous field of natural selection goes on, well then if this pension is as attractive as you think it is, I suggest that you'd have a tremendous field of natural selection and you'd probably get the best.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I'm lost. He said that he'd ask me a question and he mentioned something about the -- I'm not being funny, I just don't follow you - something about the National Hockey league. What was that? There was some different stars, is that it?

MR. LISSAMAN: Is the honourable member inviting me to make another speech?

MR. DESJARDINS: No, I'd just like you to -- yes, another speech - but I'd like to be able to answer your question and then I'll sit down right away and I'll let you make a speech. But I'd like to answer that question, and you asked me if I was ready to

MR. LISSAMAN: Well isn't there a natural field of selection because so many young people try to get into the hockey leagues, for example, and that only a few get into the National Hockey League at the top. If this is such an attraction that you claim it to be, don't you think that a little of this same selection might rub off in this instance?

MR. DESJARDINS: That's what I'm saying, that if there is so much that you can give financially you will attract everybody, and I have yet to know one fellow that plays in a National Hockey League because he wants to make a sacrifice and because he wants to do something for the people of Canada or Manitoba. I think they're all interested in making a living, and this is the point that I'm making. You stated that this pension is supposed to be based on this business that we are making such a sacrifice, that we want to attract people that - all they want to do is serve but they're starving - they're starving, and when they go out they have to go and find a job with their hat in their hands. This is exactly the point that I'm saying, that if you make it too attractive, then this business of wanting to serve your fellow man, to offer something constructive, this is exactly the point, we are losing track of the value of the pension.

The pension should be something to equalize. This I'll buy - to equalize things. In other words, if your honourable friend is losing seniority of some kind, that should equalize it. If he's losing a pension at the CPR or something, that should do it. If he asks for it because he has to hire somebody else to do some work and he has to pay, that should equalize it. But I don't want that politics becomes a business. For those that want to use politics as a career, as a means of livelihood, that's fine; but let them take the chances that people do in other jobs. Let them take the same chances as those people that try and start from the bottom to make the NHL. You might have a broken leg tomorrow; the coach might sour on him and send him to the minors. My goodness, this would be the greatest idea if there were a minors in politics. This is what we should see, then let those people take the same chances.

I don't think they have to worry or apologize for that if there is anybody that wants to make a livelihood out of politics. If they want to become a professional politician, that's fine; but let's treat them as a professional politician, and when we have no more use for him, not to say we owe you a living for the rest of your life. I'm darned sure that if this goes to committee, I'll promise my honourable friend that I'll have the president of the NHL give me all the details about their pension plan and we'll compare that one as well as the pension plan of the different provinces. It's not only the politicians who vote this thing for themselves.

Well, I think that I have covered what I wanted to cover. I think I know that some of the honourable members think again that this is a joke. I feel very sorry for this. I tried to present this in the serious way that I think it is, thinking of the individual here yes, but also of the people of Manitoba, and especially of our responsibility in this House.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, it was not my intention really to continue taking part in this debate. However, I happen to be, as is well known in this House, the MLA who is representing the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. The honourable member, I believe from Portage, wants to know what that has got to do with this. I think it's got a lot to do with it, Mr. Chairman, because in the field of politics one at various times has disagreement with their constituents, and this is one of those occasions.

What has the Honourable Member for St. Boniface being saying to us for almost an hour? He has told us, Mr. Chairman, that he is in favour of a pension plan. The motion before the House of course is that this matter be referred to a committee. Never during his long and bombastic vociferous presentation to this House has there been any substantive suggestions as to why this should go to the committee.

We have listened to a tirade from my honourable friend dealing with the National Hockey League, without reference to Red Kelly who on Saturday night finds it more convenient - and on a Wednesday - more convenient to be chasing the liens on the rink than attending duties --(Interjection)-- Two pensions, Mr. Chairman. Pension from the NHL and pension from Parliament of Canada. However, this is his business, it's not mine.

But what is my business, Mr. Chairman, is the matter under discussion in this House. This afternoon I asked of the former Premier of this House whether or not, taking due cognizance of the many years of valuable service that the Honourable Member for Lakeside has rendered to the Province of Manitoba, I asked him as to whether or not during that long period of years, whether or not any matter that affected this House and its members was referred to a

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd).....committee outside of this House. My honourable friend the Member for Lakeside said "no, that it was within our jurisdiction to decide what our indemnities should be, that it was no concern insofar as public representations were concerned as to what our indemnities should be." And then however

MR. CAMPBELL: Is my honourable friend crediting the last part of your remark to me?

MR. PAULLEY: Certainly, this is what you said.

MR. CAMPBELL: Did I say that it is no concern of the public?

MR. PAULLEY: You said that it had never been done.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, but you put on that I said that it was no concern of the public.

MR. PAULLEY: I say, Mr. Chairman, in all deference to my honourable friend, that in all of the years that he has been in this House, a number of which was the Premier of this province, that never has this particular matter affecting the members of this House been referred to public opinion outside of the House. I give my honourable friend credit, and I'm sure, Mr. Chairman, this is what he wants me to say so I will say it, but he did not agree with this. But I want to say to my honourable friend however, Mr. Chairman, that when he was the Premier of the Province of Manitoba, this was not done.

He did say in his discussion this afternoon that insofar as this matter of pensions is concerned, that this was a new consideration. How new? We have in this great Dominion of ours ten provinces and one federal house. With the exception as I understand it of Prince Edward Island, the other provinces have already established a pension scheme of some sort or other, and of course the Federal Parliament has a pension scheme. When I say a pension scheme, Mr. Chairman, I mean apart from the most lucrative pension that anybody is able to receive in the Dominion of Canada, namely the Senate, which has the best pension scheme as a result of political patronage that it is possible for anybody to obtain.

The Honourable Member for St. Boniface - and I see he has scuttled out - a few moments ago had this to say. "Members serve not to give service but to obtain a pension." Mr. Chairman, I regret this very much. I think that this is a personal barb at not only myself but every other member of this Assembly --(Interjection)-- Yes, I speak for myself, and I have not as yet come into a situation as some honourable members in this House have in respect to other matters, so I say I do speak for myself, and if the Honourable Member for Burrows, whom I think interjected, Mr. Chairman, has some other suggestion that maybe I should talk for him, I will.

But I do speak, Mr. Chairman, for myself. I resent and I regret any member of this House casting aspersions at me or any other member of this House that we are here simply to obtain a gratuity or a pension. Such is not the case, and, Mr. Chairman, if such was the case, I am positive that the people in our respective constituencies would not elect us. I think they have far more intelligence than the Honourable Member for St. Boniface gives them credit for.

So I say that as a member of this Assembly who has endeavoured during the 12 or 13 years that he has been in this House, I have attempted, albeit in my limited capacity, to give unto the people of Manitoba, and not only the people of my constituency, the best of my ability, without any additional emolument as the leader of my particular party. And I suggest, Mr. Chairman, without trying to butter myself up, without attempting to be egotistical in this regard, I think that I can truly say that I have given as much or more hours of service in attempting to fulfill my obligation as a member of this House, and I say again, Mr. Chairman, without - without any attempt on my part to be a member of this House only to receive an indemnity, to receive a pension.

My honourable friend the member for St. Boniface stated here a few moments ago that he agreed with the principle of pensions, with one or two exceptions. Every member of the Liberal Party who has spoken on this subject agrees with the principle of pensions, and yet, Mr. Chairman, because of the political connotations insofar as these subjects are concerned, they are prepared apparently to continue the length of this session day after day in order that they might figure that there's more gain in political expediency than there might be in standing behind their principles which they have enunciated of being in support of a pension plan. Which is the greater consideration? If you vote, or the question of principle?

Mr. Chairman, I don't care a continental, as far as I am personally concerned, if my constituents decide at the next election to say "No longer Paulley do we want you to represent us", but I do say, Mr. Chairman, that as far as Paulley is concerned, I still have to shave in the morning and if I can stand before the mirror and look myself square in the face and say that I did right, because I believe it is right, notwithstanding what my constituents may have to say,

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) I think I'm the better man than some who have taken part in this debate.

My honourable friend the Member for St. Boniface speaking a few moments ago referred to the question of making provisions so that it might become too attractive for individuals who may seek public office. Does he want to turn back, Mr. Chairman, to the seventeen hundreds, your early 18 hundreds when only the landed gentry were financially able to take part in the government of the day? Does he want to resurrect those sort of conditions? Does he want to continue the restrictions that are placed even today on people of meagre means to take part in the governing of their community, of their province, of their nation? I say to my honourable friend whom I represent in this Assembly, this isn't my idea. I'm positive, Mr. Chairman, that this is not the idea, or the ideology of the majority of my constituents, with maybe one or possibly two exceptions. So I say, Mr. Chairman, he's one of the men that I might have to appeal to for support in the next election, has prompted me in speaking to his House tonight.

Again, Mr. Chairman, what is the proposition before us? You have a motion, Sir, that this matter should be referred to a committee. I say, and I'm prepared to accept the responsibility - as I hope that I am - as a responsible member of this Assembly, I'm prepared to accept my responsibility. If my honourable friend is not, if he wants to have this sent before a committee which may be packed with individuals who feel along his line, that's his business. I make no apology at all for accepting my responsibility in this Assembly, as indeed I made no attempt to do otherwise insofar as Metro is concerned, as a member of this Assembly to accept my responsibility as to whether or not Metro should be instituted. This is my responsibility. It's always been the responsibility of members of this House dealing with those matters that have personal concern to the members of the Assembly.

Mr. Chairman, my honourable friend the Member --(Interjection)-- No, and never will be. My honourable friend the Member for St. Boniface talks about the rush at the tail end of the session of this particular legislation. Mr. Chairman, this is not the only piece of legislation that has been brought before this Assembly in the dying moments - at least once we presumed - of this Assembly, and in other pieces of legislation, with amendments as well almost ten minutes after the introduction of the resolutions. Has my honourable friend said anything about any other piece of legislation?

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, does the honourable member want me to answer that now?

MR. PAULLEY: No, I do not. The answer is obvious. The answer, Mr. Chairman, is obvious. This isn't the only piece of legislation with which we as members of this Assembly have been confronted with within the last week. It is not the only piece of legislation that we've had before us in the last week for which amendments have been proposed within 24 hours of the legislation being placed before us. But, Mr. Chairman, I think it's the only piece of legislation of this particular nature of introduction and amendment with which my honourable friend takes exception to. I'll have something further - when another bill is before the House - to say regarding this aspect.

But, Mr. Chairman, you have a responsibility. Your responsibility is to have members of this Assembly consider the motion that is before you, namely, that this matter be referred to a committee for consideration. I suggest to you that in accordance with the democratic principles of democratic government, the responsibility insofar as this legislation is ours and ours alone, and let us face that responsibility. If my constituents or the constituents of any other honourable member in this Assembly do not agree with us in this situation let them speak when they have the opportunity to cast their votes against us.

I make no apologies for my stand in this. I believe in the principle of pensions, and if perchance, Mr. Chairman, there are clauses within the legislation that we are not favourable to, as members of this House it is our duty, indeed it is our responsibility, to propose amendments to change the legislation. But to slough off for political expediency - as is evident in this House today - the consideration of this matter, is in my opinion beneath the dignity of members of this Assembly.

MR. STEINKOPF: Mr. Chairman, I won't be very long. It's very difficult to get up after listening to that eloquent and intelligent address. It's quite a departure from what we've had and what we've been listening to most of the day. There's been one or two others, but in the sentiments that have just been expressed, let me add my complete concurrence.

The longer this debate goes on, it's more apparent the more personal it will become, and it will be difficult to turn back the clock. I've had a personal experience of how dirty these

(MR. STEINKOPF cont'd). things can get; how out-of-hand they become; how far removed they get from the motion that is before the committee; and how seemingly useless it seems to be for anyone who is not used to the kind of speeches that we've had all day today.

However, no matter how often I have mentioned it, it doesn't seem to have any effect on the Honourable Member for St. Boniface or the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, that there has been a considerable amount of thought and energy and work put into the bill. I am free to admit that it is not fool-proof. I have never, either in this Legislature or anywhere else, seen anyone who has drafted any bill that found it without some method or some way of improving it.

We spent a good part of a year, as you know, with the very best committee brains that we could on a revision of a companies act, and the ink had hardly been dry on the draft before the same lawyers found not one, not two but a number of mistakes in the draft. Sometimes these are matters of opinion; sometimes they are clerical errors. So what has transpired in this bill, I make no apologies for it. I've said, not once but many times, that I am in favour of the principle of pensions be they in business or be they in this Legislature.

Again I would like to point out as clearly as I can what type of pension is in effect in the other provinces and compare those pensions with what we have suggested to this House. The effective date of the pensions in British Columbia, April 1st, 1955, just ten years ago; in Alberta, for Ministers, April 18th, 1954, and for members, April 1st, 1964; in Saskatchewan, January 1st, 1954; in Ontario, April 1st, 1960; in Quebec, October 1964; in New Brunswick, January 1st, 1958; in Newfoundland, March 20th, 1962; in Nova Scotia, January 1st, 1954; and ours in Manitoba, presumably June 1st, 1965.

The contributions: Ministers in British Columbia - 6% of his salary, the member - 6% of his indemnity; in Alberta - 5% of salary plus indemnity and expenses, five for the member, 5% of salary plus indemnity and expenses; for the Minister in Saskatchewan - 7% of salary, for the member - 5% of indemnity; in Ontario - 6% of salary or indemnity for both the Minister and the member; in Quebec the Minister contributes 6% plus 1 1/2% if he wishes half of it to go to his wife, the member contributes the same amount - 6% plus 1 1/2 for his wife; in New Brunswick - 6% of his salary with a maximum of \$6,000, for the member - 9% of his indemnity; in Newfoundland, Minister - 7% of his indemnity and the member - 7% of his indemnity; in Nova Scotia, Minister - 8% of his indemnity and the member - 8% of the indemnity; in Manitoba, the Minister - 6% of his salary, the member - 6% of his indemnity.

The maximum number of years or the maximum term that the pension is paid: in British Columbia, 24 years; in Alberta, none for the Minister and 35 years for a member; in Saskatchewan, nil; in Ontario, nil; in Quebec, nil; in New Brunswick, a Minister for 15 years, a member for 25 years; in Newfoundland, a maximum contribution of \$4,000; in Nova Scotia, nil; in Manitoba, after 55 there will be no limit, under 55, twelve years.

The minimum term required before a pension is paid: in British Columbia, two terms; in Alberta, the Minister five years, the member ten years; in Saskatchewan, ten years; in Ontario, they've just amended it and I haven't got the last figure; in Quebec, the minimum term is ten years; and the same for New Brunswick, Newfoundland, and Nova Scotia; in Manitoba, eight sessions.

The provincial share in British Columbia is 9% of salaries plus indemnities; in Alberta, simply a guarantee; in Saskatchewan, equal to the contributions; in Ontario, matching; in Quebec, 75% of contributions; and in New Brunswick, matching; Newfoundland, matching; Nova Scotia, matching; and in Manitoba a guarantee.

The minimum age in British Columbia is 55 years; in Alberta there is no minimum age; in Saskatchewan, 55 years; in Ontario, 55 years or optional; in Quebec there is no minimum; in New Brunswick, 60 years; in Newfoundland, 60 years; in Nova Scotia, 60 years; in ours, 55 years or for twelve guaranteed years if it's under 55.

The calculation of the pension in British Columbia is 3% of the average income for a 10 year period times the service; in Alberta it's 2% of the average five highest years times the service with a maximum pension of \$11,200; in Saskatchewan it's one-fiftieth times the average five highest years times the service; in Ontario it's 75% of the contribution with the Ministers having a maximum of 50% of their salary; in Quebec, 75% of the contributions; in New Brunswick, members get 4 1/2% of the average three years highest salary times the service with a maximum of \$2,400, the Ministers have 2% of the average three-year highest salary times their service with a maximum of \$1,200; in Newfoundland —(Interjection)— I have \$1,200 here but I think they get both the — that's in New Brunswick, yes; in Newfoundland,

(MR. STEINKOPF cont'd) 75% of the contributions with a maximum of \$3,000; in Nova Scotia it's one-twentieth of the average last three years times the service and the maximum is 75% of the average indemnity.

In British Columbia there is a widow's benefit of one-half of the above allowance till death or remarriage; in Alberta, the widow receives two times the contributions or if a member served a minimum of ten years, pension actuarially calculated; in Saskatchewan there is no benefit for a widow and neither is there any in Ontario; in Quebec a widow receives a half of the pension if all contributions have been made; in New Brunswick a half of the pension until her death or remarriage, if married before member was 50 years of age; in Newfoundland a widow gets a half of the benefit; in Nova Scotia, the widow gets one-half of the benefit; and under our plan we have no benefit for a widow.

In Prince Edward Island there is no plan at all, and anyone who has studied this bill can see many similarities in our bill to those that are in the other eight provinces. Some of them have been in existence for over ten years, and although they have not made the history of their plans available to us, it is only reasonable to presume that it's working out fairly well otherwise others wouldn't have had the same type of format.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the Speaker.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, would it be possible to get copies of the statement that the Minister read to us, because this is the information we have been seeking for some time.

MR. EVANS: You haven't asked for it.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would give the information that I asked for regarding applying the minimum length of service - minimum length of service that qualifies a Minister for pension -- well, everybody, everybody on the minimum length of service.

MR. STEINKOPF: full indemnity has been paid.

MR. CAMPBELL: No, but I mean -- I asked this in my brief address, Mr. Chairman, that I'd like to have the Minister's figure of what he computes the pension to be under this bill, the minimum pension for everybody that's mentioned in the bill.

MR. STEINKOPF: For all 57 members of the House?

MR. CAMPBELL: No, no. There are just after all a few categories - the Premier, Cabinet Minister, the Leader of the Opposition. . . .

MR. STEINKOPF: Yes, I worked that out while you were talking earlier today and I have it here somewhere.

MR. CAMPBELL: I'd be glad to have that put on the record, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

MR. CHAIRMAN: Madam Speaker, the committee wish to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Vital, that the report of the Committee be received.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, that the House do now adjourn and stand adjourned until 2:30 Monday afternoon.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 2:30 Monday afternoon.