

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Saturday, May 8th, 1965.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section 1, passed; Section 2 --

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, while we're on this bill, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that this committee recommend to the House that Bill No. 110, an Act respecting payments to Members of the Legislative Assembly and Ministers 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 and Orders.

MR. CHAIRMAN presented the motion.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Mr. Chairman, I haven't spoken on this resolution yet and I suppose I cannot be ruled out of order for being repetitious or speaking too long so I'll proceed now to say what I think as far as this resolution before us, or this bill before us, stands now.

I'm not going to lecture anybody because I'm not a lecturer. I will not philosophize much because I'm not a philosopher. I'll simply state what I think of it in simple language as any layman would do. The Premier of Manitoba likes to talk about priorities. He seems to make a lot of it - first things first. In his budget speech he criticized the Ottawa pension plan and I suppose that in his opinion there was no priority here. That may be one of the reasons why he criticized the plan but then when it comes to a pension for himself, for his Ministers and MLAs of this Chamber, this seems to be quite a different matter, a matter of urgent priority. It is so urgent that the government is rushing this legislation, this bill, through in the dying days of this session. It may be a matter of priority in the thinking of some.

Now much has been said that a pension for MLAs is necessary in order to encourage good citizens to stand for election as representatives in this Legislature. In my opinion, I really think that this is exactly what we should avoid, this "carrot" or this kind of inducement is wrong. I say that it is not desirable and it is not going to induce the right calibre of men to offer themselves for this service. I would rather say that the desirable incentive or motivation of any person who enters this arena, the arena of politics, should be the desire to serve his countrymen and to improve their lot.

In the past we have known many people who have sacrificed even their lives, and monetary inducements did not motivate them. I have spoken to several members of this Chamber who are presently sitting and quite a number of them told me that at the time when they did run for office as an MLA, practically everyone whom I asked said, "I did not even know what my remuneration would be if I was elected." So surely it wasn't the monetary incentive that motivated this person to try for this high office.

It was mentioned by the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources that some good men refuse to try because they could not afford to do so. I cannot subscribe to this theory. I would say that this reason given was not the reason. It was simply an excuse. The real reason could have been one of two - one or two of many things, such as probably some of them were afraid of defeat; another reason could be different political philosophy; third reason, probably the abhorrence of politics, because they hear so much about politics, and some people really and truly think that politics is not clean. There could also be a feeling of incompetence on the part of the party who's asked to try. It could be some personal or family history in the background which the individual does not want to have exposed or scrutinized and it could be many many other such reasons, but I'm sure that it wasn't the fact that the individual could not afford it.

If the individual really and truly does think that the remuneration is not sufficient, and this is the only reason, they I say, this is the calibre of person who is not of that calibre, not of the calibre who should sit in here, if it's only the remuneration that keeps him away from here. I would say, avoid such a person.

As I said before, I knew before that there were some candidates who consented to try politics and eventually were elected and who didn't even know what the indemnity was going to be. And I know that most people, and I mean those that did not try this yet, think that \$4,800 for two and a half month's work is more than enough. The people at large think that. They multiply this by 4.8 -- 2-1/2 months -- to equate it to a year, relating it to a full year, and come with an equivalent of over \$23,000 per year. Of course, no member gets that we know, but they just relate it that way. And as far as they are concerned they think that we in this

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd),house are adequately remunerated.

Another argument used, that many former members found themselves in need after retiring from politics. It is quite true and I know of some but let us ask - those fault is this? And I'm not casting any - what shall I say - feelings of my own on the character of the people, but I would say this, who can say how much worse they might have been without participating in the politics. The reverse is quite true. How many of them could have been better off if they stayed out? And this all is a huge 'if' and I do not think that it applies; or in other words, it applies to any person, even the person who presently may be lucky to call himself a millionaire. We had examples of that in the past, in the 1930s.

I would like to say here that probably we hear a lot of talk about the birds and the bees and I'm going to leave this to the doctors and the chiropractors, they can tell about the birds and the bees, but I'll talk about the bees and the ants for a while. Maybe we should take example from the bees and the ants and not take example from the grasshopper. Now I'll have to concede that these people whom I referred to, who found themselves in dire circumstances, would have benefitted through a pension if there was one. I mean the ex-MLAs. A pension probably would keep them fed and keep them warm, if they're not fed and warm now. So this brings us now to the principle of any pension - it doesn't matter which pension it is. The members, and especially the government members of the Legislature and the Ministers, in their great hurry to give themselves a pension on ceasing to be members here, have disregarded the basic principle of any pension scheme and that's what we come to. The principle as I see it, of any pension plan is to make sure that once a person is forced to retire due to age or incapacity that he does not go hungry and that he is not cold and our society through the Welfare Department takes care of some of that.

Now let's come back to this pension plan. Does the principle apply in this proposed plan? In my opinion, no, it does not apply. It may apply to a certain degree, in the case of the backbenchers of which I am one, but it certainly does not apply as far as the Cabinet Ministers are concerned. The principle doesn't. This truly is a case of proposed pension benefits for Ministers being nothing more than a case of making the wealthy rich. The principle is lacking. Again I repeat, that the principle of any pension plan should be to assure that a citizen does not go hungry or cold and not to make the wealthy rich. If a pension is desirable it should be based on the MLAs indemnity in all cases, which is \$4,800 at the present time. And I think that would be more equitable. I say, if it is desirable. However at this time I cannot support a bill which requires that the tax harassed citizens of the Province of Manitoba finance even partially a pension plan, for those who are responsible for these tax increases and it's the MLAs, and especially the government, who is responsible for these tax increases and I can't support the bill. We are to blame for imposing the taxation - the government members and the Cabinet Ministers - for imposing these vicious taxes. It is the Cabinet Ministers who tell us that the people of Manitoba -- they tell them that they must dig deeper into their pockets because the Provincial Treasury is short of money to provide necessary services for them. The Cabinet Ministers and the Premier tells them that by imposing new taxations. Now they intend to use some of these vicious tax receipts to feather their own nests, or feather their own beds. This is inconceivable and I would like to say that the government must have had this in mind, among other things of course, when the Minister decided to increase taxation. In my opinion this is not timely; at a time when we tell the people of this province that you must dig deeper into your pockets, then we tell the people at the same time, you must provide a pension for us, for the guilty party.

Our economy is not ready for it and I say cannot stand it at this time, no matter how small it be and I would say, as my Leader has suggested now, that we have a committee study this and comment to this House later on this matter.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C. (Selkirk): It appears to me that of late, this government has embraced or adopted the oriental philosophy of face - they will not retreat because they feel that any retreat is a loss of face or a loss of stature. I would suggest to the government that in this particular instance they should adopt the motion moved by my Leader and thus show to the people of Manitoba that they are a government of stature and a government which is willing to look into this thing more thoroughly than was done when the legislation was first introduced, with a view to correcting some of the very obvious errors and omissions in the present legislation. Had this legislation, Mr. Chairman, been noted in the Throne Speech, or had there been any prior consultation between the parties in this House respecting the contents of the intended legislation, I am sure that we would have had a better bill before us now than

(MR. HILLHOUSE cont'd) the bill with which we are dealing, and if any proof of that is required, all we have to do is to take a look at the amendments with which we were given shortly after the first opposition to this bill was raised. The amendments are an improvement over the original bill as drafted but this bill, even with these amendments, is still lacking in a lot of respects and I think that a great deal could be done if my Leader's motion were adopted by this committee and this matter were considered, not in the heat of debate in this Chamber but in the quiet reasoning which would follow in a committee to which the public would be invited.

There are certain aspects of this bill which I do not consider to be correct. One is this, that a man could be a defeated candidate and still take the advantages of this legislation because the bill says that any man who is a member on the coming into force of this Act, may at any time within one year after its coming into force elect to contribute under the provisions of the Act. To me it is conceivable that there could be an election between the coming into force of this Act and that man's election to make contributions. In other words, you don't have to be a member of this House in order to elect to pay contributions under this Act.

Another place too where I think there could be an improvement made and that is in the length of service. This Act only provides for a minimum of eight sessions - eight regular sessions it says. Now according to my interpretation of The Legislative Assembly Act, all sessions are regular sessions and there are no such thing as special sessions, although we have in the past been calling them special sessions and giving special indemnities to members. But apart from that consideration altogether, I think there are a lot of respects in which this bill could be improved and I would strongly urge the government to give this matter more careful consideration, not in this committee but by referring it to the committee suggested by my Leader. I would like to point out to Mr. Chairman that I have always been led to believe, and I think it is fundamental law, that a trustee must be more careful with the money that he is handling than with his own money and we are - or at least the government is - the trustee of the funds of the people of Manitoba and I submit that they must use, not only ordinary precautions, but extra special precautions before spending that money to see that that money is spent to the best advantage and I submit that they are not doing that here.

But apart from that altogether, Mr. Chairman, there are one or two matters I think in respect of which this bill could be improved. This bill as it reads now, even with the amendments would permit and allow a member of this Assembly not only to receive this pension after leaving the Assembly but would also permit that person to keep getting that pension even if that person became a member of the House of Commons, a member of the Senate of Canada, a judge of either a Superior Court or an Inferior Court or an individual occupying a position with the Crown in the right of Manitoba in any other capacity.

Now I think these are matters that are very, very pertinent to the substance of this bill and I think these are matters which should be given consideration, and I therefore support most heartily the motion made by my Leader and I urge the government to accept the motion, not to reject it, on account of that oriental philosophy which they seem to have adopted.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Chairman, I welcome the motion before us because there are certain things contained therein that I feel are of merit. First of all the committee that this bill would go to is a committee represented by all groups in this House. Secondly, it would give an opportunity for the members on that committee to bring about equality of pensions for all members alike. Had this not come about, I had intended to move an amendment that would delete Part II of the bill. I think there is too great a disparity and discrepancy between the ordinary members' pensions and that of the Cabinet and others listed under that part of the bill. However, should this motion get support I think it's so much better than to just have that part deleted. In this way the whole bill would be reconsidered and certainly, as has been pointed out, there is no rush to this legislation. This can surely stand another year and the committee would be meeting between sessions, so that this thing could be considered and given more thought. I, for one, don't expect an election coming up in the ensuing year, and I think this view is held by more members than just myself and I certainly can give the motion before us support. The amendments that have been brought in by the government since the bill was introduced have been brought in to accommodate the views of some members of the NDP group I think and, in my opinion, are worthy of support as well, but I think members should give support to this referral motion that is before us now. I think it's worthy of support.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. GROVES: I'm sure, Mr. Chairman, that we've heard all the arguments now on both sides of this pension plan. We've heard it compared with the birds and the bees and the grasshopper and the ant and I'm surprised that the honourable members of the Opposition haven't thought of another analogy and I'm sure that if I were a member of the Opposition I would be tempted to recount to the members the story of the three little pigs. You will remember that the three little pigs left home and they came to a fork in the road and they all went their individual ways and one little pig built his house of straw, and the other little pig built his house of wood and the other little pig built his house of stone. And the little pig that built his house of straw, the big bad wolf came and huffed and puffed and blew the house down and ate up the little pig and the same thing happened to the little pig that built his house of wood and only the little pig that had built his house of stone was able to survive the huffs and the puffs of the big bad wolf and he alone was not eaten by the big bad wolf.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I'm sure that we could take that story, if one was a member of the Opposition, and apply it to the motion that's presently before -- not the specific motion but this bill that's before the House. Because the three little pigs left home, the same as they had in the nursery rhyme story and they are decided to go into politics, and the first little pig got elected to a Legislative Assembly that didn't have a pension plan and sure enough when his time came to retire from politics and the big bad wolf, in the form of looking out for his future and supplying his family with groceries, etc., came along and huffed and puffed and took away his clothes and his groceries and left him destitute. And the second little pig got elected to a Legislative Assembly that had a pension plan only for MLAs - backbenchers - and this little pig, he fared a little better than his brother and he was able, because of this pension of his, to build a house of wood and although it was a much more substantial house than the first little pig, over the years the huffing and puffing of the big bad wolf in the form of security and those things that we look forward to in our old age, sure enough his house crumbled as well and he was removed of his raiment and his food, and he ended up and spent the latter part of his life also in destitution. But the third little pig was much more fortunate than that; he was elected to a Legislature and he became a Cabinet Minister. And he got a rather attractive pension plan because he was a Cabinet Minister and he was able to build his house of stones, and because of his good fortune he was able to withstand the huffing and puffing of the big bad wolf and lived out his life - not in luxury perhaps but certainly in much better circumstances than his brothers and was able to live out his years in comparative comfort.

So, Mr. Chairman, I'm rather surprised that the members of the Opposition omitted to make this analogy and I'm sure that if one were to borrow a book of nursery rhymes from the library that you could find many other circumstances that you could fit to the type of argument that we've heard.

I wouldn't want to sit down and let this be recorded for the eyes of future historians as my contribution to this debate on the matter of pensions. And I think that we should get serious, that we should, now that we've heard all these arguments, get out of this fairyland that we've been in for the past little while and get down to some serious thinking about the issues that have been raised. And I have to admit, Madam Speaker, that the members of the Opposition, they've got themselves a good political gimmick that they can work the dickens out of, not only for the balance of this session, but for next session and during the election campaign, whenever it might come. And in addition to the pension plan that they have been contributing, I have to frankly admit that they have some other good political gimmicks. The Honourable Member from St. Boniface this morning mentioned one of them. He brought out a picture that was in the newspaper, this was taken of one of the walls at the Conservative convention with the slogan, "Let's Get All Manitoba Out of the Red." Well I'm sure that if I were a member of the Opposition and I were standing on a platform and I had a receptive audience in front of me that I could make a lot of mileage out of that one too. And I'm sure that if I were a member of the Opposition that I could make a lot of mileage out of the heating tax and I could make a lot of mileage out of the cards that the Honourable Member from St. Boniface had this morning and the other day. And I could probably make a lot of mileage out of the goose preserve and the other things that have been mentioned in the debates in this House.

However, the honourable members of the Opposition I think should keep in mind that they don't have to convince me and they don't have to convince the members on this side of the House. There are after all, as I said before, better men than I and better men than the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, that could be doing just as good a job here. The people that they

(MR. GROVES cont'd). . . . have to convince are the people of the province, the people that are going to cast the ballots at the next provincial election. And on ballot they are the ones that are going to have to decide whether this government deserves to go down to the ignominious defeat that they predict, solely on the basis of whether or not we brought in a pension plan for members. The electors of this province are going to have to decide in the next election campaign whether or not the Liberal Party is an acceptable alternative to the present government. --(Interjection)-- I think they are - they are going to have to decide on the basis of all these little gimmicks that are going to be trotted out and used, they're going to have to decide whether these people are really an acceptable alternative to the present government. They've got to decide too, despite all these gimmicks that are going to be trotted out, whether or not the Liberal Party has done in this Legislature and in the next one, and in the past few, an effective job as the Official Opposition. They also have to decide whether the individual members, not only of the Liberal Opposition, but whether the individual members of this House in all parties have done a proper job for their constituency and whether they have brought to the Legislature of this government constructive ideas for the progress of this province. And they are going to have to decide too -- and I'll keep coming back to the pension plan, Mr. Chairman, so that I can be at least a semblance of being in order -- they've got to decide, despite the criticism that this pension plan is going to get and these other issues that are going to be trotted out, whether the candidates that are offered by the Liberal Party and the other parties in this House, are acceptable people to represent them in this House. They have to decide too whether in their opinion they want the present Leader of the Opposition, or whoever the Leader of the Liberal Party might be at that time, whether they want him to be the Premier of this province. They have to assess those who the Liberal Party have put up as candidates in the various constituencies and decide whether or not these are people which they wish to take on the administrative responsibilities of government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will the Honourable Member please keep to the motion before us, that's to refer this matter to the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders.

MR. GROVES: Oh, are we speaking to that specific motion or

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. GROVES: Oh.

MR. CAMPBELL: On a point of order, this is -- it has not been the practice in the House, to keep to the particular motion. If that was followed in the House, I'd have a good deal of sympathy with it but it just has not been the practice and we are bound in this committee by the practices of the House, and by the rules of the House. --(Interjection)-- That's right. One of the rules is that if anyone wants to speak, he stands up. So I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that you're going to find that on this question you'll have a good many of us that will be covering both the general merits of this motion - why this should be referred to a committee and the principle of pensions, all at the one time and I submit to you that we have to go by what we do in the House and that's not to divorce the two.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I would agree that it should be kept to the principle of pensions on this motion, but in my opinion, we are getting away from that. Rule 38, again I would point out, refers to the fact that the speeches must be relevant.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, on the point of order, surely my honourable friend from St. Vital -- and he doesn't need me to defend him because he's quite able to defend himself -- but surely if he wants to talk about the contribution that different members make here and say that in an election that the public must decide as between this party and that party and this leader and that leader and that sort of thing, surely this is in order on this debate because surely that is not only related to but quite central to the theme of eligibility for pensions.

MR. GROVES: My only comment, Mr. Chairman, is that it has been suggested by members of the Opposition that this pension plan is something more than just a pension plan, that it's something that's going to lead solely and almost exclusively to the defeat of the government. And surely some of the other speeches have strayed a bit off the specific track of the pension plan. However, I'll abide by your ruling. But if you'd just bear with me for a moment, I'm going to come back to the mention of the pension plan.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Go ahead, but keep it to the . . . of the pension plan or the motion.

MR. GROVES: If you'll just keep in mind -- if you'll just bear with me for a moment, I'm not going to mention the pension plan right now. All right? --(Interjection)-- As long as I come to it eventually. I won't be very long, Mr. Chairman. So, to pick up my train of thought, I was mentioning those things that the people of the province are going to have to decide, if they're

(MR. GROVES cont'd).going to make a change in the government. And I think that we also have to consider that if, at the time of the next provincial election, the people are acceptable or susceptible to a change, they also have to consider the New Democratic Party, whether they are an acceptable alternative to the present government. And I must say that on the basis of their performance in this Legislature, certainly if I were in the position that some of them will be in and that I was susceptible to a change, that I would tend, on the basis of their constructive performance at this session, to favour them. And they're going to have to decide whether the government programs of parks and roads and the improvements that have been made to the school system in the past few years - whether the improvement to the system of welfare in the province, are things that out-weigh any anger or displeasure at our at this session having introduced a pension plan, whether we introduce it now or whether we refer it to the committee mentioned by the Honourable Member from Selkirk.

And they must consider all of these things, I think, on balance. And the pension plan, I am sure Mr. Chairman, isn't by any stretch of the imagination going to be the sole reason why the people of this province are going to decide to reject this government and elect another. By then, a year from now, if this Bill will have passed, we will know how many of the members of the Legislature have chosen to elect to become part of this pension plan. The world, Mr. Chairman, won't come to an end I am sure if the present government were not re-elected at the next election or the following one. And I am sure that I and the other members on this side of the House weren't sent here by Divine Providence to be the sole persons to govern this province. And we won't have Heaven on earth either Mr. Chairman, if the Opposition after the next election becomes the government of this province. And I as an individual wouldn't even contemplate blowing out my brains if the New Democratic Party became the next government of this province, despite the many uncomplimentary things that have been said about them at this session. And again I say, on their performance, their constructive performance at this session, they certainly might warrant some consideration. No one issue led to the defeat of the previous administration and no one can make me believe that it did. And I'm going to say a few nice things about the Honourable Member for Lakeside because I think - I thought at the time and I still do - that he headed a good government for the times in which we were living and I give him full credit for that. His misfortune I guess was the fact that times changed and he didn't change with the times, but I must say that the Honourable Member from Lakeside has some principles, he has a philosophy that I think did this province well during the difficult times, particularly during the war, when he was in office and we must give him credit for having stuck to those philosophies and that's more than a lot of other members of his party -- that's more than we can give them credit for.

All the arguments that are before us now in connection with this pension plan we've heard on many occasions. There will be lots of opportunities at the next session of the Legislature to debate these matters again and ultimately I think that the people of this province are going to have to decide whether, on the basis of this pension plan, all the dire things that have been predicted by the Opposition should happen to those of us on this side of the House.

So I would appeal to the honourable members, surely there aren't any new arguments that can be brought out in this debate and I would ask them to consider us disposing of this bill, debating it again at the next session of the Legislature when one can see perhaps in better perspective how many have enrolled and there is time to consider what the ultimate effect might be and also to consider that they're going to have lots of time and lots of opportunity to pursue the point that they have been pursuing now about whether or not this outweighs all of the creditable things that have been done while this government is in office.

So I appeal to them to let's get on with this Bill. We have another one that I am sure is going to take up some discussion and I'm sure that all members would like to see the end of this particular session.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. MARK SMERCHANSKI (Burrows): Mr. Chairman, I cannot see why the matter of the pensions cannot be worked out in complete detail and this should have been done in consultation with possibly all concerned in this House at somewhat an earlier time schedule. I cannot see the wisdom in the matter of urgency at this late hour of the present sitting of the House. Now I feel that all members in this House are making, and do make, a contribution to the matter of every-day debate and procedure in this House and I think that on the one hand we seem to be preaching the fact that it is demanded of us to make a sacrifice in terms of time, and we're also reminded continuously that it is a place of high principles, and I quite frankly, Mr. Chairman,

(MR. SMERCHANSKI cont'd). cannot understand the approach that it is mandatory or highly desirable that there be some type of a pension scheme in order to attract the right type of people into the political arena. I do believe that most of the members sitting in this House have got other professions or other business interests, except possibly the members of the Cabinet and that this places a somewhat different approach as far as a pension scheme is concerned, as compared to other people who are employed in our society. And I think that I would like to look upon my service to this House something along the same line that I have contributed, and I am quite sure others have, in terms of other community projects and groups to which we contribute of our time and effort.

I also feel, Mr. Chairman, that to rush this as we appear to be rushing it through, that I honestly think that if we ask ourselves the question as to how fair we are being with ourselves and the taxpayers in this province, I think we have to come to the conclusion that we are unfair and that we are taking a distinct advantage of the taxpayer of this province. I feel that it is completely unrealistic because the bill outlines a pension system on two levels. Now it appears to me that the average member of this House who is not a member of the Cabinet is in one category and the ministers are in another. And I think when you analyze the bill and what it proposes to do to the average member in this House who is not a Cabinet Minister, in reality it contributes very little. On the other hand, Mr. Chairman, the Ministers of the Crown are very competent individuals, or they are regarded as such, and by that very virtue, Mr. Chairman, is one of the basic reasons why they are possibly less in need of a pension scheme than the other members in this Chamber, because during their term of office they are constantly dealing with the industrial world, with the business world; they are able to work out contacts, knowledge, ways and means of business administration and it would be one of the last things that they should worry about as to what is going to happen to them in the event that they are voted out of office, because these are the people that have within their ability to contribute, to contribute of the utmost to society, to business and industry in the province. And to think and say anything different, Mr. Chairman, just simply does not add up.

The other feature is, I do think that there are many people in this province that look with a great deal of resentment about the members in this Chamber working on the basis of a pension scheme. Mind you, I do believe that a pension scheme has got its merits, but Mr. Chairman, this should be thought out on a proper basis, this should be worked out in conjunction with what is being done in other similar industries, which is the Province of Saskatchewan, the Province of Ontario, the Federal Government, or any other province, but to make a presentation of a Bill at this late hour and then admit by members of the opposite side that as late as last night they made certain observations that certain facts pertaining to this pension scheme were misquoted by certain editors in the newspapers. Mr. Chairman, if this is such an important issue, if this is such a vital importance to the members in this House, I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that whoever is responsible for drawing up this bill, I think that he also is responsible to present to us an illustrated chart showing up exactly what is involved, rather than have everybody put their own interpretation on the meaning of this Bill.

There also seems to be a lack of good faith because this government seems to preach to us on the basis of the good times, the good conditions, industrial growth that have been created and an atmosphere that has been produced by the efforts of this government. Well, Mr. Chairman, here again, if this is the climate, if this is the type of atmosphere that has been created, I strongly recommend to the Ministers of the Crown that as leaders in the business world and the community there is much less sense to talk about a pension scheme by trying to put it through in the last dying hours of this sitting of the House. Why not give it the proper importance? Why not take it out of the realm of urgency? Why not have it studied properly, analyzed properly and let us practice some of the very same basis that this government preaches. Let's go out and make a feasibility study. Let us make a study of this, and analyze it and I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that if it is a proper analysis, and if it is sold properly, then it's going to be an advantage to every member in this House. I feel that this entire effort is unrealistic, it's unnecessary, and we seem to be rushing into something that we still don't seem to quite understand. And, Mr. Chairman, there are many suggestions which are well meant and these suggestions are generously offered, but at times these are not feasible and they are not practical, and at the same time you have to at times come to the conclusion that under those conclusions it is not economically feasible.

We should not be guessing on such an important issue. If it is as important as some of the members on the opposite side seem to suggest, then let us take a little longer time, let us delay

(MR. SMERCHANSKI cont'd).....this issue until the next sitting of the House. Let us strike off a committee or recommend it to the committee that is sitting on some of these other matters and let them analyze it so that we can be presented with a proper conclusion and on these bases, I am quite sure that we would find very little difference among the various members in this House.

It appears that the philosophy in this whole matter is that if it is only possible to establish a toehold or to get one's foot in the door that maybe public opinion will die so that at a later date we can simply amend it or change it and this is a lot easier than bringing in a brand new bill. And I know that there must be a certain amount of doubt in the minds of some of the members in this House and I say this, on both sides of the House, in that at times, it is a matter of loyalty to the party, it is a matter of our responsibility to be in unison with what our party would like us to be, and in terms of what is truly the correct and proper dictate in our own mind as to what our people in our constituency or what the public opinion might tell us to the contrary. And it is for this Mr. Chairman, that I do not think that this is like a broken record, because when the man who is the mover of this entire principle admits that he is confused about figures, so the fact of the matter is, why weren't proper figures prepared? I can't understand this. Why weren't proper figures prepared? And if the honourable member anticipated criticism of this nature, then, Mr. Chairman, he is at fault by virtue of his own action. To criticize the account in the newspaper is of no consequence. These accounts were only criticized based on the facts that were presented in this House by the responsible Minister, and it is up to him to set the record right.

Mr. Chairman, in any situation where you're confronted with a new move such as a pension plan, you have various plans; you analyze them; you study them; you want to know the reasons supporting a certain plan and why one plan is better than another; and I venture to say, Mr. Chairman, that the Honourable Minister does not know the actual facts pertaining to what is involved in terms of the amount paid in, the amount to be received, and under what conditions. There seems to be a great deal of confusion, and if there is confusion, Mr. Chairman, as admitted by him, I want to ask the individual members in this House to what extent they understand the terms of the proposed pension scheme, because I am certainly not clear. I am confused into the bargain. And Mr. Chairman, in industry or in your own business you would not travel along this road. You would be a little more cautious. You would want some time out. You would want to have the proper consultation. You would want to have the proper directive from those people who know what they're talking about so that we would know exactly where we are heading in reference to terms of retirement, and how much, and how many years we've been sitting here (or sessions), and get all these facts lined up.

It would appear, Mr. Chairman, that the classical mistake is certainly no fault of ours on this side and I suggest that we delay this bill. I would suggest that this be put into the hands of a proper committee and that a proper study be made and brought back to us at the next sitting in order that we would understand the items or conditions involved in this what appears to be a very important matter. And the reason it appears to be an important matter is this, Mr. Chairman, that the taxpayer of Manitoba today, he is annoyed. He is annoyed by all these outside taxes, and the pension scheme means just that additional 1/16th of a cent or a quarter of a cent or a half a cent more on his taxes. This is an insignificant amount in terms of the one cent analogy, but it is important when you speak in terms of several thousand dollars; and I think that the taxpayer today is rightfully annoyed and he has just cause to be annoyed.

Mr. Chairman, to say that some of this is due to political expedience, I regret a statement of this nature because I wonder to whose political expedience this is charged to. To whose political account would you charge this to? And there is no panic button. There is no trap. There's simply a proper explanation that should be given to us and a proper one that should be made.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to observe one over-all basis and that is this. It would appear to me that this additional tax which may only be the extent of a straw that broke the camel's back is completely out of proportion, and until we apply the proper business approach to this matter -- and I would strongly recommend to this government that they apply this stick or standard of comparison to themselves which they so very much preach and recommend so highly to others. I think that this, Mr. Chairman, is a shining example of what this government is preaching to others and does not carry out in its own circle of proper recommendation, as has been shown by this matter of the pension.

(MR. SMERCHANSKI cont'd).....

Mr. Chairman, I'll simply close on the basis that I will never forget the present Premier of the province, shortly after his election to this office, went on the TV and on the air on many occasions and said there would be no increase in taxations in this province, and we have seen nothing but increased taxation; and Mr. Chairman, the public of today is very much annoyed through this renewed pension scheme arrangement if it may not be a very costly matter in terms of dollars and cents. This is not fair to the taxpayers of Manitoba, and furthermore, if you analyze the background of every member in this House, there are very few members sitting in this House that, if they would search their inner souls quite deeply and ask themselves to the amount that this pension scheme is going to contribute to them - I would exclude some of the older members who have sat in this House for many years - but some that have sat up to four and eight years, I don't think that we are in such dire need that this matter should be passed in this sitting of this House, that it should be decided on today or on Monday. I very strongly recommend that we delay action on this, refer it back to committee, and let's bring it up at the next sitting of the House.

MR. STEINKOPF: Mr. Chairman, the last speaker suggested that in presenting this Bill I had suggested that I was confused and gave some rather confusing facts, and to the extent that after listening to me apparently he too has been confused. I never recall having used the word in any of my remarks on this Bill so far. I have tried to, in my own way, set the facts of the Bill out. They seem to be most straightforward. I would think that they are so easy to follow in the Bill that even one not used to dealing with the astronomical figures that my honourable friend the Member for Burrows is used to, I think that almost anyone could understand that after a person has been here or attended eight sessions and is no longer in the House and they had contributed to the pension plan for part of it, that they would be entitled to three percent of the total amount that they had contributed, of salary or indemnity that they had. It is just that simple. It is a three percent figure.

The statement that he made and repeated that we were belittling the cost of this to the taxpayer, to the Provincial Treasury, is of course his statement and not mine. Nor have I ever heard it reiterated on this side of the House. The figure was given on request as to what we anticipated the annual average cost of the pension plan to be, and we made the statement. It's one of these situations where, after the figure has been given, others in the opposition have taken it and said that even if it were correct, even if it were a small amount, it should require the attention that they thought a Bill of this importance should have. We, too, agree with that and have throughout. This is an important Bill. It affects not only those of us in the House but certainly it affects all Manitobans, even more in the principle than in the dollars that are at stake.

Throughout the debate and no matter how long it goes, I am satisfied that all members of the Opposition will agree that the pension plan is a good principle and should be adopted for this House. Why, then, do they belabour the point? Why do they keep on suggesting that it be referred to a committee for further study? This I cannot comprehend. Maybe this part of the debate is where I'm a little bit dull. I think that the reasons can only be political, and notwithstanding the remarks by the Honourable Member for Burrows, there seems no other justification.

The pension plan in itself has been studied, has been studied not for days, not for weeks, not for months, but for years. This plan -- there has been talk of a pension plan, as one knows, in this province for many years, and as long as I have been here, in my work as the Minister responsible for the superannuation fund for the civil servants, I have watched and studied these figures, having in mind what type of a pension plan would be suitable for the members of this House; the fact that other provinces have instituted plans, some of them going back quite a number of years; the fact that there is a plan in Ottawa; the fact that these are in existence under as close to circumstances as we have in this House as one could get, far closer than any private plan where you have contributions usually by management, by individuals themselves - the employees - and worked out on an actuarial basis not only for that small plant no matter how small that plant may be, or that operation, or the business, but based on a type for the whole industry. And we in fact took in mind what our industry is. Our industry happens to be that of the business of making laws and looking after the interests of the people of Manitoba.

I'm sure that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, in his eagerness to prolong the debate, can play on any phrases or words that I may utter. My reason for entering the debate

(MR. STEINKOPF cont'd). a second time this afternoon is purely, I think to again try and do my best to point out the fact that the plan has been given study. It is a simple plan. If there are any questions that anyone would like to ask about this plan we'd be very happy to answer them. I'm sure we can. There is no confusion. It is a simple plan; it is simple to understand; and I hope that if they are sincere in their statements that this is not a game of politics, that they will sit down and spend these many hours that they have already spent on this plan, and if the brains of this House were harnessed in an effort to take a look at a good plan we would have had more energy and effort than all of the sittings of any kind of a committee had it sat for many days after the session, and I again suggest to them that they stick to the Bill itself; if there are any complaints or any suggestions or any information that they want, that this is the approach to take; and that we get on with the business of passing the bill, because we are here to wait until they do make up their minds to ask these questions and we are prepared to give them the information.

MR. DESJARDINS: the Honourable Minister would clarify he thinks that I was prolonging the debate when I spoke approximately half an hour this morning - that's all I spoke today - I wonder what he means by that? I thought I stuck pretty well to the plan or the Bill. I asked him certain questions. I don't know, unless he answers them this afternoon. I wonder what he means by that? I think that this is quite unfair. I spoke about half an hour and he spoke about three or four times.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: I wonder if the Honourable Minister would permit a question. If this Bill has been so thoroughly studied and if this Bill has been prepared with such detailed information, why wasn't this Bill brought in earlier in the session so at least we could have had a chance to have a look at it and study it; and if all this study and all this preparation has been done so early in the game, and it's all been studied, nothing was rushed into it, why was this Bill brought in in the last four days of this sitting of this House?

MR. STEINKOPF: Well, for the very reason that we were studying it, that it wasn't ready, that we went over it and we studied it until the very last minute. We had to consult with others, with our own members, our own caucus, which we did; and we brought in a bill which we think in its presentation is so simple and so easy to compare with other bills of its type in operation in Canada, that we were proud of having the bill here. And it's true somebody can suggest that shortly after the bill came in -- the Honourable Member for Gladstone even went so far as to suggest that the amendments to the bill were made before there was any discussion on the bill, but this I don't think was the fact. It was after there had been a number of suggestions made by some of the honourable members in the Opposition and of the NDP party that that amendment that has been presented was brought before the House.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would permit another question? Why, if this Bill has been studied for years as he said, was it necessary to wait until the dying days of the session to consult with his colleagues in his own caucus. He gives that as a reason for not bringing the bill in earlier in the session. He said in his speech that it had been studied for years. If so, then surely it could have been discussed with their members long before the end of the session. Secondly, if it had been studied so thoroughly, why was it necessary to bring in such major amendments to it within three days of presenting the bill to the House and within a day of having it discussed here?

MR. STEINKOPF: Well, Mr. Chairman, it's a matter of time. We are talking about time: why wasn't the bill brought in 30 or 40 days earlier than what it was? May I suggest that the welfare of the members is not certainly in my mind and I'm sure in the minds of some of, or most of my colleagues, ahead or placed ahead of that of the interests and the welfare of the people in the Province of Manitoba, and this session has been a long one and a very busy one. This is only my third session - third or fourth; that it is by far the best in respect to legislation that has been brought before this House. The number of bills have been brought forward in a very businesslike manner. They have been prepared well. They received a tremendous amount of interest not only from the Opposition but the public at large. This government has shown its willingness to lead. If it hadn't, why I'm sure they wouldn't have brought this bill in. Anyone knows there's no political advantage to introducing a pension bill for one's self. This is probably one of the most hazardous occupations that a politician can get himself involved in, and it was a bill that we were working on right until just a few weeks ago, a few days ago, and then had to get the thing cleared; and this is the reason it is here and for no other reason. It was not planned to bring it in towards the end of the session. It just happened that way.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): permit a question? Why wasn't this important piece of legislation mentioned in the Throne Speech if it was all planned out this well?

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman. more questions to ask the -- I didn't intend to rise again but he said I was prolonging the debate. Now the Honourable Minister said that this has been studied for years, been studied for a long time, and he had to bring it to the caucus; this was the right thing to do. They had to get all kinds of information; This was the right thing to do. Providing, I believe all this right now, how can he turn around and say that after he brought it in in the last day -- and we have asked, this is only the second day - we had a very small part of the day Thursday afternoon - well we are bringing it today and he says we are prolonging the debate when we ask questions that he doesn't even answer, that he can't answer. He said that it had to be brought to the attention of the Conservative caucus. Well this is one question that I'd like him to answer right now if he can. What is the duty of the Opposition? Does he feel we are only merely rubber stamps; because he tells us this has been studied by the Conservative caucus, we should pass this. This is No. 1. I want him to tell us what we are supposed to do if we feel there is something wrong. But I think we have proven our point already, because he has already made an amendment and this morning I pointed out something else that he had no answer for this. He couldn't correct that.

Now there's another question that he's never answered. We have heard an awful lot of priorities, and -- let's say that we believe in the sincerity of this government. If they're so far off this on the priority list, I'd like to know. I think we are entitled to an answer on this. And then we want -- we mention an awful lot about is the time right; would this -- especially, as far as I am concerned, with this tax on heat; a tax that was admitted by those who spoke from the other side of the House that wasn't a good tax; it was a tough tax; but that was the limit. It was either that -- in fact we had a motion or an amendment that said it was either that or a sales tax and the sales tax is supposed to be the worst one of all. Now I want to know. I want the Minister -- I'm ready not to prolong it like he says. If he can stand up now and tell me: All right, we'll discuss the question of time as related to the tax, to the heat tax, and explain this, give me his reaction. Even if I don't agree, once he tells me what he feels about this, then if he tells me that this is a fair plan, that he said that it's fair for the public, that it's not an extreme plan, that the benefit is not too high; if he tells me that this is it, with the contribution that they make, especially the Cabinet Minister, that he feels that the 70% of the maximum is all right, if he can tell me that he endorsed the plan, that his colleagues who have studied it for years endorsed this and are ready to put it, very frankly put it up to the public and say; this is what we did; now you're the judge, this is another question I want - and, as I said, the priorities.

Then I want him to explain a little bit what our duty is. He says we have been discussing this for so long, and we are just bringing it up; this is an important thing, as he says, that wasn't worth mentioning at all in the Throne Speech. And we feel that it is not right - and he's talking about talking politics and so on, because we feel it is not right. I think that we're entitled certainly to express our views here. This is only the second day that we have talked. Certainly he is wrong when he is talking of prolonging the debate when I spoke half an hour on this today.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Welfare) (The Pas): Mr. Chairman, may I just say a word on this subject. With respect to priorities, I think this has been an item that has been pretty low on the priorities of this government for some time, because I recall my first months in Cabinet where the former the Provincial Secretary, the Honourable Marcel Boulic, had this as one of the programs that he felt should be implemented, should be brought in for the benefit of the Members of this Legislative. And why was he thinking about that? He was thinking about it primarily because we saw some of the tragedies of that '58 election. We saw some of the people who had been cabinet ministers who did not have their houses built of brick and have the nest eggs tucked away that some people have mentioned, and who had very great difficulties in readjusting to life outside of the government. I think I know from personal experience in my present portfolio that there have been other members of the Legislature who were not cabinet ministers who have been in very severe difficulties, and who after 20 or more years of service to the public have had to receive public assistance, and I think it is a tragedy that people who have given of themselves in service to others without thought of themselves have had to face this sort of a situation.

(MR. CARROLL cont'd)

Now we talk here, the Member for Burrows, about rushing into a plan. I don't think we are rushing very quickly when we are the second last province in the Dominion of Canada to have a pension scheme. This certainly isn't rushing it by any means - one of the last provinces to try to bring in a measure which has long been recognized by employers of Canada as being something that's worthwhile for their employees (and I consider the members of this House to be employees of the government). I think the government should certainly be doing something to protect their interests because I think the days have changed considerably, and then when they leave this House, particularly after serving on a full-time basis, face the world - if they've been here eight or ten years - which is quite different from the world they entered, and many of them will have to go back and take re-training either, in the medical profession, of a year or two in post graduate work at a time when they have to maintain a large family responsibility, others will have to start from scratch to build a practice; and I think that there are many responsibilities which we have that prevent us from accumulating for the future as we might normally be expected to do.

But I think really this has not been high on the priority of the government, because it was thought up back in 1958; it has been discussed from time to time. This happens to be the year in which it was brought in. And I say the main reason for having brought it in was some of the tragedies that we had seen from previous elections and some of the people that have come to our attention, and we think that this is quite wrong. We hope to correct it by means of this particular plan. We don't think it's an unconscionable transaction. In fact we think it's unconscionable that some of these people have been treated the way they have, that through circumstances they have ended up having to rely upon public assistance for the last few months of their lives. I think this is quite wrong and I think this will provide that little extra something which will help to provide people who have given service to the province and who return to private life.

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (La Verendrye): Mr. Chairman, I don't intend to make a long speech on this bill, but I would like to say a few words to qualify my vote on this particular bill. Being a new member in the Legislature here, I have always been very concerned with the picture we should try and paint to the general public in the province, and after I was elected, whenever I was asked to speak in schools or audiences anywhere, I always tried to give my impressions of this Legislature, and I've repeated many times that I was very impressed with all the members in the Legislature; that I thought that the Province of Manitoba had here people that were just as sincere, honest and dedicated as we could find anywhere. And then again, you often hear from people, especially in the last few years because, well I think changing times have had to do with it, but we in this Legislature, for example, voted ourselves an increase when we came in, not too long after the people in Ottawa voted themselves an increase, and now at this time to vote ourselves a pension - and I'm not against the pension as such - but to vote ourselves a pension at this time in the closing days of the session and in, as one might say, in a locked room where we're the only ones that can discuss it, and voting ourselves something that is beneficial to us without having it go to a committee as most other bills do, I cannot support this bill at this time.

I would support the motion that it go to a committee where people can come and make representation, give us their views, although I'm not who thinks that all the legislation that is passed here should be according to the popular ideas of the people - certainly we have to make decisions that are not popular - but in this case where we are voting ourselves something, especially after we have just increased taxes heavily in this province - last summer we have seen a large increase in taxes - and after, as I said, we have ourselves voted an increase, I don't think is the proper time. Certainly there is no rush as far as I'm concerned that this legislation should pass right now. It could be dealt with in the committee and brought back at the next session, and as I say, before this committee people would appear, insurance people would be there and offer maybe plans that would surprise all of us; and we should remember that as legislators we like people to do something for themselves and we should certainly make sure that before we vote ourselves a pension from the funds of the province, that we have experienced all other avenues of providing ourselves pensions by contributing from our salaries through plans that, being bought in a block, could probably be just as nearly as favourable as this here. So therefore, I would strongly suggest that it be sent to a committee where people have the chance to appear, because of the simple fact that we are voting ourselves something here, as one might say, behind closed doors. I think this is doing it too fast and I will support the motion that is before us.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the Minister of Welfare a couple of questions, because I wasn't quite certain whether I heard him clearly --

MR. PAULLEY:.....to ask a question? There's been an interjection of another speaker in between.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well, with the leave of the committee and with the permission of the Minister of Welfare, if he wants to answer, fine and dandy. If he doesn't, someone else can, but I thought that he stated and re-stated that former members of this House had actually been on welfare. That's what he said. They were in such dire straits that they had actually been on welfare. That's what I understood him to say. Then I would like to ask him or the Provincial Secretary, because I haven't got an answer to this one yet, what would be the consequences to the people of this House or the people of the province if it was delayed for a year? How would our welfare be affected financially or otherwise? How would it be affected if it was delayed for a year? Now, could I have an answer to both of those questions? Was I right on the first, and an answer to the second.

MR. STEINKOPF: Mr. Chairman, I can't answer the first part of that but the second part, I haven't heard a good reason why it should be delayed a year.

..... Continued on next page

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, we've heard a good deal about the proposition that this legislation or this bill, should be held off for a year and submitted to a committee. It is my firm opinion that this course of action is completely unnecessary. However, if the government should feel it to be politically wise, I think they would be justified, and they couldn't be faulted either way, in my estimation. On the one hand, if anyone who has had an interest in this matter has investigated it at all, he would be quite familiar with the pension legislation proposition and he would be equally familiar with the kind of legislation that has been implemented in other jurisdictions, so then he would know now what the bases of comparison are. However, I think it is also necessary to say that if the government feels that the Opposition is trying to get some vicarious kick out of this filibuster binge they're on today, they're completely justified in holding it and submitting it to a committee. And if it goes to committee, what will be the net effect there? I presume that opinions will be solicited as to the propriety of the pension, and we will hear pros and cons, and the question will also be asked of whoever appears as to whether they think the amount of the pension is too high or too low, and we will have varying opinions on that too. The fact of the matter is that this kind of legislation or this kind of subject matter is something that concerns this House.

I asked yesterday: what has been the past practice whenever we have been dealing with matters relating to indemnity? I said that if the past practice over the past decade and more, had been to deal with it in Committee of the Whole, then why depart from that practice now? If it has not been the past practice then it's perfectly justified to submit it to a special or select committee. It is not as though there are some things that cannot with all propriety be discussed in the Committee of the Whole. It is a fact that in the House of Commons in Britain there are times when the members see fit to discuss things without, as they call it, "strangers in the gallery" and so on. I don't think that that's necessary. Let it be reported. What's the point in having it go to a year-long interim committee? The fact is that I am convinced that if you relate this pension proposition which we have before us in Manitoba to the pension plans in effect in the other provinces, you will find correlation. Also -- and I think this is important since it has been raised by the Leader of the Opposition. He made a point yesterday about how we could be justified in voting on pension legislation when one bears in mind the standard of living throughout the province, in certain pockets of the province and so on. But I must point out that in certain provinces, like New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, the per capita income is much lower than here, and the pension legislation is on the books and has been for a period of years. Newfoundland also. I think that it should be said that we should compare the pension proposition here to the per capita income and then relate that ratio to the pension paid out at the different stages in other provinces in proportion to their per capita income, and let us see then how we stand; and this has already been done and this pension legislation is not excessive. It compares favourably.

The Member for St. Boniface, when he was speaking earlier today, made some point about after eight years in this Chamber does the province owe you, owe any member here a living? Mr. Chairman, after eight years in this Assembly and after having reached the age of 55, a member would receive \$63.00 a month. Who can live on \$63.00 a month? It is not intended as a means of paying someone's living or paying for someone's living. It's merely intended to make adjustment. It's merely intended to allow members who have served here for a period of time, to compensate them so that their own regular pension plans, are not unduly lowered because of their having served here, and it should also be pointed out that this plan is voluntary. Those who object in principle to it need not avail themselves of it.

The Member for St. Boniface also said something about the fact that people who have fought in the armed forces do not receive a pension of the generosity that this proposal provides, and I would merely retort to that that after 15 or 20 years in this Assembly, the pension provided will be such as to provide for a very, very modest living indeed. After eight years it's impossible, as I said, to live on \$63.00 a month. But after 15 or 20 years it would provide something that is just slightly below a livable pension, and I would point out that in the armed services today, after a period of, I think it's after 20 years one qualifies for a pension, and it, too, just barely provides for a living after 20 years of service. In fact one could argue that it doesn't really provide for a living on its own. But it helps. And that's all that this legislation is intended for - to help. I'm not speaking now with regard to the Cabinet Minister's position - I'm going to come to that later. But insofar as the pension payable to members - private members - is concerned, after eight years, 63 bucks a month. Now they - I would ask you - are

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . they serious when they talk about this providing a living for ex-private members of this Assembly?

It is a fact, Mr. Chairman, that it is precisely this kind of proposition before us now that lends itself to the most abject of partisan appeals. I can recall, not personally, but from my readings and from documentaries on the CBC, that when there was a change of government in Ontario in 1934, that the incoming Liberal premier, Mitchell Hepburn, made a great deal of political capital out of the fact that the former Conservative ministers all had their own cars provided for them by public funds, and he made a big to-do about auctioning the cars off, and they were auctioned off, and this really sent his popularity soaring. But what was not equally well-publicized was within a period of two months each cabinet minister had a new car, blacker and shinier than ever.

The Member for St. Boniface talked about politics and political figures, etc. I wasn't quite sure of the intention of some of what he said. He objects, I suppose, because this bill - this is the essence of their objection - because the bill is not being sent to a committee for further study. In the light of that, it could be objected to. I don't know if he is going to object or not but we have a motion from the Honourable Member from Swan River, sending his French language bill to committee or for further study for the next year or two. I suppose that he's going to oppose that on the grounds that it is unnecessary procrastination and delay. I suggest -- and I might be inclined to agree with him on that. It would be unnecessary delay. The matter could be dealt with on its merits here.

Similarly, this pension legislation can be dealt with now. Members here - it's not as though this was the first time they've heard of pension legislation having to do with elected representatives. It's been on the statute books in Canada. I don't have to go outside of Canada to Washington and Sam Rayburn; it has been on the statute books in Canada now for at least a decade, at least a decade - a little more - and in most of the provinces for a decade and slightly less. I know, I know that a political party that takes the position that they have taken will find favour with some segments of the population, but I'm also convinced that when it is related to the people, that what is involved here, the pension of 63 bucks a month for somebody who's been here eight years when he reaches age 55, and slightly over a hundred dollars for somebody who's been here for 12 and 16 years, and approaching \$200.00 for those who've been here for 20 and 24 years, no one is going to take serious objection. I'm satisfied that no one is, because what is involved here is not astronomical sums. In fact I would go so far as to say that the \$63.00 a month pension which applies after eight years at age 55 is really meagre. Now who would want to object to that? All it's intended for is to supplement, and can in no way be stretched or conceived as enabling one to eke a living from that pension alone.

I think, Mr. Chairman, insofar as -- a lot has been said here about cabinet ministers and the pension they will be entitled to. I think that it must, I think it must be said that this should be related to the federal House. The kinds of salaries and pensions paid in Ottawa must be considered when you're considering the wages and the pensions payable under this legislation to Ministers of the Crown here in the province. They give full time to their work as do the people in Ottawa, and I think it's wrong, basically wrong to sort of segregate and have two kinds of treatment. The people that the Member for Ste. Rose spoke of the other day in Manitoba, low income and so on - and he related that to this pension legislation. It should be pointed out that these people, while citizens of Manitoba, are also citizens of Canada, and if people who are on low income in Manitoba object to even the concept of pensions, meagre or medium as they may be, they have an even greater right then to object to the pension and salary scales being paid in Ottawa, and they are after all citizens of Canada and should be related in that context as well.

It might vary - the practice be varied from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. I understand that in Alberta, for example, there is no pension paid at all to private members, but that there is a pension payable to ex-ministers of the Crown, the reasoning there being that cabinet ministers give of their full time, etc., and should therefore qualify for some sort of pension consideration after having given a certain number of years' service. Unless the members of the Liberal Party can show that the ratio of proposed pensions here to per capita income in Manitoba is out of line, or exceeds that of the ratio of pension payable in, say, New Brunswick, to per capita income in New Brunswick or Nova Scotia, then their argument really does not have much validity. I would certainly agree that the pension payable in this province, and the ratio of that pension to per capita income should not exceed, should not exceed by one dollar the ratio as paid in other provinces, but I say with equal emphasis, and I say so - I don't care if it's

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) reported from one end of the province to the other - I would say with equal emphasis that neither should it be less. Neither should it be strikingly less. A little bit less perhaps. You can ignore it on the grounds that you can't have perfection of ratio relationship, but while stressing that it should not be out of line upward, I say with equal emphasis, why should it be out of line downward?

I think that the public, on the one hand, can come to resent, can come to resent pensions that are unduly generous. On the other hand, I think that the public should not appreciate, should not appreciate at all any effort made to keep the indemnity and proposed pensions payable, to keep them so low as to make Manitoba stick out like a sore thumb relative to other provinces. You know you can take this to the ridiculous extreme where the governing party would be afraid to bring in any kind of indemnity legislation. The cost of living, let's say over a period of 20 years, the cost of living could go up "X" percent. The governing party could be paralyzed by fear from making any upward adjustment in the indemnity. That wouldn't do the province any good, would it? But yet a government could be so paralyzed if it knew that any attempt whatsoever to bring the indemnity up to a reasonable ratio would be met by an Opposition filibuster.

Let us look at the indemnity we have in this province today. I don't think anyone here would suggest that it is out of line. If anything, it's out of line downward, but no one here would suggest that it is really too high. Well then, when was the last time it was increased? Back in 1959, I believe, or '63. The government in 1963 may have decided that there was political harm in bringing in that increase, in which case our indemnity would have been somewhere back at the pre-1960 level, and that Mr. Chairman, I say without any hesitation, would be too low for the good of this province. Or let's say back in '59 that they had decided there was too much danger in proposing any increases because it would be met by opposition criticism, in which case the indemnity would have been at the level it was in the early '50s which I understand was around \$2,100 -- 1,400 and 700. Well, who would suggest here that in 1965 an indemnity of \$2,100 would suffice? Who would say that this would be good for the province? What I'm suggesting now is that while we should not, while we should not vote ourselves indemnities on the scale voted in Ontario and Quebec, nor pensions on a similar scale, nevertheless we should look at the per capita income ratios, etc.

Mr. Chairman, I don't know if many members realize this, but the Legislature in Ontario does not sit for any longer than it does here, and the duties of a private member, while he may represent more people, his duties as a legislator - that is in the legislative process - are not any more lengthy than they are here, and yet despite that you have an indemnity imbalance of almost - well yes, in fact, it is. Theirs is 275 percent higher, 11,048. Say two and a half times higher. That it should be higher I have no question. That it should be that much higher, perhaps it's not for me to say but it does indicate that we're not, that the indemnity here is not out of line, and since the pension is related to the indemnity, the pension itself will not be out of line.

MR. MOLGAT: honourable member permit a question? Is it not correct that the Ontario Legislature has a fall session as well as a spring session, and that they actually do sit substantially longer than we do?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I wouldn't say "substantially longer". Their sessions in the winter, or late winter of the year, rarely run for more than six weeks. We've already been sitting how long here? So the point is -- in the case of Quebec it must be conceded that their sessions run five months because, I suppose, they are in fields of legislation and so on that the Federal Government is opposite to them and so on, but for which an indemnity is paid of \$15,000 a year. And while I'm on that point, Mr. Chairman, I should point out that when the Federal Parliament's indemnities were raised to 18,000 there was a bit of a background story to that. Because when the governing party, the Liberal Party, proposed an increase, they did consult with the Whips of the other parties and they would not reveal the extent of the proposed increase. All they solicited was a commitment as to whether or not the parties were in favour of the principle of an increase which, when granted, the indemnity was increased, but at an amount that was not disclosed until it was actually tabled in Parliament. An increase from ten to eighteen thousand dollars at one fell swoop. And on that occasion, Mr. Chairman, the attitude of two members there in particular stand out. One was the Leader of the Opposition the Right Honourable Mr. Diefenbaker, who opposed the increase, and another one who was inclined to oppose it was Bert Herridge, New Democrat for Kootenay, and this latter gentleman happens to be a New Democrat. He also happens to be independently wealthy - we have a few of those. And he said that he really was not inclined to be sympathetic with the

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) idea of an increase; he thought that the public service aspect of serving in the Commons was reward enough. He realized that indemnities had to be realistic but he didn't think that the magnitude of the increase was warranted. And then he said openly in the House of Commons that while he himself saw no particular need for this, he was astounded to hear that some private members of Parliament in all parties did indeed have difficulty maintaining two homes, transportation, etc., and I suppose one must concede that there are these hidden expenses and some not so hidden, and he came to realize that some members were actually in debt, and some pretty heavily in debt, for having served in the House of Commons for ten or fifteen years. And he voted for the legislation even though he himself didn't have any particular need for it. He could have taken the position that it was wrong and that he was unequivocally opposed to it. He might have made himself a bit of a folk hero, but he chose rather to do the prudent thing, and I think it is prudent in this situation to vote for the pension legislation - no one is arguing with the principle.

What then are they arguing with? With some of the details. That it's not funded, I presume, is one aspect that they object to; that it's payable after eight years; that the province owes them a living after eight years - at 63 bucks a month. I don't think there's too much to complain about there; that it's payable at 55 - what's so unrealistic about that? I think, Mr. Chairman, after all is said and done, that the Liberal Party here must surely have mixed motives in opposing this legislation. I am sure that they have considered pension legislation in the past. I am sure that they are fairly familiar with the different pension plans in effect in other provinces. I am sure that the Leader of the Opposition is - he had the Ontario legislation before him the other day. And I am sure he is aware of the Federal legislation.

I don't think we need apologize for putting through pension legislation when it is part of the law of the land in other provinces and at the Federal level. I don't think we need apologize as long as that pension payable is not out of line with that payable in other provinces. I think those last two points are really the ones that should be dealt with. I don't think that we're entitled here, obviously we're not entitled to anything more, and I would like to hear just cause or reason why we should not see fit to bring in legislation that would give certain members here as much compensation after their defeat as would their counterparts in other provinces. I don't know if other provincial assemblies went through this same sort of manoeuvring that we are going through now. I will have to check it now; I will have to check it through various back newspapers or Hansards or however; because I think what we find there will be indicative, will be indicative whether or not this is the kind of subject that the Opposition just naturally likes to play on, or whether it is only the Liberal Party in this province that seeks some partisan game by seizing on something that can so easily be misunderstood.

As to the accusation that this legislation was brought in too late in the session, that may at first glance seem to have some amount of substance, but it is not the only piece of legislation that was brought in a little late in the day. There were other pieces of legislation too; some more complicated than this. We have still shared services to deal with. Should that be delayed too? In my opinion, it should not and neither should this.

MR. CAMPBELL: I am sure I would not have spoken again in this debate if it had not been for the remarks of two honourable gentlemen across the way. I was very interested in the remarks of the honourable member who just took his seat and I would like to refer briefly to them, but I can't blame him. I hope the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources is not leaving, because, as he would guess, he is one of the ones that prompted me to speak and I am sure he would like to hear what I have to say. My honourable friend the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources is one of the gentlemen who is to blame for me being on my feet at this time. The other one, of course, is the Honourable Minister of Welfare.

But before I mention their contribution to the debate, I would like to comment briefly on the remarks of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead, an honourable member for whom I have a very high regard. He's the kind of a man that I am very glad to see in this House because I think he has a lot to contribute and I always listen to him with interest and I don't always agree with him. I frequently do go a long way with him, but today for some reason it seems to me that he was off the beaten path, and pretty badly; because when I hear a person of as great ability and as logical thinking as my honourable friend, say to us, if I understood him correctly, that we should relate our pension to the Maritime Provinces in comparison with per capita income, now really, Mr. Chairman, really. That isn't good enough for my honourable friend. To begin with, we shouldn't relate our pension to anybody else's pension. We're masters of our own fate in the Province of Manitoba. We can have a pension or not have one, as we decide

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, would the honourable member permit one important question?

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, sure.

MR. SCHREYER: I would like to ask the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that if he disagrees with me he is partly to blame, because he is the one who impressed me so much with a passion for uniformity of legislation. Now I would ask him, what happened to his passion for uniformity of legislation?

MR. CAMPBELL: This is - - agree completely with the principle of uniformity of legislation as far as it's practical in something that you want to do. But for goodness sake, don't do something that you think is wrong. Don't do something that you disagree with. Don't put in a policy that you don't believe in, just in order to be uniform. And this is where I must differ in passing with my honourable friend the sponsor of this bill, because he has said that everybody here is in agreement with the principle of this bill. I am not in agreement with the principle of this bill because the principle of this bill is pensions for the legislators of the Province of Manitoba. And I am not in favour of pensions for the members of the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Manitoba, because it's a part-time job for the private members. There is hardly a member that you can mention in this House who hasn't another position or profession, and a good one. Show me one. And in the other case, in the other case, the other qualification - I'm in favour of the system of pensions. Of course I'm in favour of pensions, but it's pensions for people who are on full-time employment, for people who work in industry.

My honourable friend the Minister of Welfare says that pensions are adopted as a policy in Canada. Of course they are. Of course they are, and with that principle I'm in complete agreement. But it's for people who are in full-time employment and permanent positions, and even the Cabinet Ministers do not qualify on the basis of permanent positions. So I do not agree with the principle. However, the principle is going to be adopted by this committee, no doubt, and so I recognizing the inevitableness as far as I was concerned. I'm quite willing to do what I can to say, "Well if you're going to have the pension, then deal with it as reasonably as possible." And I do maintain that we should give further consideration to this question and that the place to give it is in one of the committees that's already established.

Now to get back to my honourable friend, the Honourable Member for Brokenhead - and I have a very high regard for him and I was so sorry to hear him make such an illogical statement as that. We don't have to follow the lead of any other province unless we think that's the right lead, and I never advocated uniformity for something where we don't agree with the principle. And to suggest that we should in some way or other follow them so slavishly that we relate our pension on the basis of per capita income with theirs on the basis of per capita income, I think is entirely illogical.

Then my honourable friend dealt, at least as much of the time, I think, with the question of indemnity as he did with the question of pension. And of course the two are related. I'm not objecting to that. And I am in favour of proper salaries being paid to Cabinet Ministers. I am in favour of an indemnity. This is the reason, this is the reason that in the democracies of the world they fought for years to get indemnities, so that people who were not of great means could represent constituencies in parliament. And I am in favour of an indemnity, an indemnity that's exactly what the term means: to indemnify for the time that you give to the public service; and I am in favour of Cabinet Ministers' salaries, Cabinet Ministers' salaries to the extent that is proper. I certainly think they're high enough now, particularly for the people that are getting them, but I'm not objecting to that basis. What I am objecting to is the principle of pensions for people who are not on full-time employment and for people who are not occupying permanent positions.

My honourable friend mentioned - and I was interested to hear him relate this circumstance - about the fact that the two outstanding opponents of the indemnity increase - and I'm sure that's what he was speaking of - in Ottawa were one prominent Conservative and one prominent NDP. Well now, I can't claim any particular affinity with either one of them. Dief would be just as displeased at me claiming affinity with him as I would be. We wouldn't, either one of us; and yet we did happen to be born in the same year. That was a big year for Canada one way or the other. That's about the only connection I can claim with him. I certainly can't claim the characteristics of the Honourable Member Mr. Herridge because I gathered that he was independently wealthy. I wish I could claim affinity with him in that regard but I'm not able to. So that it is not a meeting of minds with these folks and myself because of any similarity in our background or our present circumstances or anything of that kind, but I'm willing to ascribe to them equally

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd) honest motives and sincere ones that I would want to be applied to myself. And when my honourable friend from Brokenhead says that the Liberal Party must have mixed feelings about this particular question of the pension -- undoubtedly there will be differences of opinion in the Liberal Party too. Thank goodness, for the sake of the public, they don't all agree with my stand that my honourable friend the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources would characterize as a dinosaur or paleontological attitude or something of that kind. We have members in the Liberal Party who do represent different points of view, but we are certainly agreed on this, that it would be advantageous and proper and right to hold this bill up awhile and not rush it through in the dying days of this session, and to send it out into a public committee where the people who are going to pay these pensions have a right to be heard.

MR. PAULLEY: permit a question? The honourable member has been associated with this Assembly for a considerable number of years. Can he indicate to me if at any time, dealing with the matters of indemnities pertaining to the members of this House, that during his term of office in this House, that the proposals were sent to a committee outside of the House where public representations could be heard respecting the indemnities - in this case pensions - and were subject to scrutiny by the public.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I would say to my honourable friend that my recollection is that the question dealing with indemnities was dealt with in the way that's suggested now, but never in my time, has there been a bill - until the last few days - introduced concerned with pensions, and I maintain that it's a new procedure in the Province of Manitoba and that it would be perfectly right and proper that it should be sent out. Does my honourable friend wish to ask another question?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask a supplemental question, and of course it appears from the answer to my first question that the honourable member agrees so far as indemnities are concerned, and this is also applicable, I would suggest, to salaries of Cabinet Ministers and Leaders of Opposition and the Speaker of the House, that the public have not had the opportunity to make representation. Does my honourable friend not agree that on matters of this nature, albeit pensions, it is the concern of this House and this House has to make or give its answers to the public outside in this instance to the same degree as they have to give it in respect of indemnities or salaries for the Leaders of the Opposition or of the Cabinet?

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I am not worried about the 40-minute rule here because of the fact that if you call me to order on the 40-minute rule I can just wait until somebody else has spoken and then I can get up again anyway; otherwise I would certainly object to my honourable friend asking me many questions when he takes the occasion to make a speech on every one of them. And what my honourable friend is really wanting to get around to - and I'll help him to get around to the question - and that question is: did you increase the indemnity some time while you were heading the government? And the answer is "Yes." Yes, we increased the indemnity; that's right. We increased the indemnity and we went into the Committee of the Whole. This is right. If this is what my honourable friend is wanting to get, and if he's trying to show that I was inconsistent, that I was not uniform as I'm supposed to always be, in the fact that once during my tenure of office as a Leader of the House that legislation was introduced which increased the indemnity, that's correct. That's correct.

But this is a new procedure. This is a pension. This is a pension matter, the first time to come up here in this House. The indemnity has been both reduced and increased in the time that I have been here. I was here when the indemnity was reduced from \$1,800 to \$1,500, and it applied to the Legislature that did it. That was quite okay. I'm in favour of that. I still maintain that any time that the indemnity is increased, it should be increased by a particular House to apply only to the next one, and we didn't do it that way either. But I still say that's the right way, and this should be right with the pension bill; and the pension bill should not apply, in my opinion, to the people who are presently members of the House at all, until they are re-elected again, and then they start from scratch, every one of them. And as far as anybody that speaks in here making any exceptions because of the fact of the old-time members, I don't want any exception made as far as I am concerned. I don't want an exception. I'm not interested personally. I'm interested only from the point of view of a new step that's being taken in the Province of Manitoba, namely the introduction of a pension scheme which we have never had before, and I say it should be held over and considered during the recess because we have seen that it has not been, in my opinion, fully considered up to date.

Now in the hopes that my honourable friend the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd) . . . will be back in a little, I'll speak to my honourable friend the Minister of Welfare in the meantime. My honourable friend the Minister of Welfare says that one of the reasons for introducing this pension is because this government saw some of the tragedies of the 1958 election, and his colleague the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, speaking in the debate earlier, conveyed to me that he had said "members of the Government of that day." I haven't heard before me and I have to take the words as I remember them, but I want either one of them to tell me of a case where any member of the Government of 1958 had the slightest difficulty in finding a position. If my honourable friend is talking about the Cabinet Minister who was in our government and who came from up in his area, I can tell him that that Cabinet Minister found not the slightest difficulty in finding a job. If he's talking about either of the two cabinet ministers - or if my honourable friend the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources is - about either of the two who went back into municipal life where they had been before, as municipal-treasurers, I can tell him that both of them had no trouble whatever in finding jobs and that one of them has been regularly employed and the other one has been turning jobs down ever since. If there are cases of these kinds I have never heard of them. Not one. Not a single one. And as far as our cabinet ministers are concerned, I should be pretty well-informed because I keep in close touch with them. I'd like to know the cases of those tragedies.

Now admittedly, Mr. Chairman, admittedly they didn't go back into \$17,000 jobs. No they didn't. They took a reduction in salary. But they went back into the kind of work that they wanted to do, the same as we folks will go back into our work when we get dismissed from here, but that's no tragedy; and to take maybe a temporary readjustment necessary and all that sort of thing, because they may not carry on the standard of living to which they have become accustomed while members of the cabinet, but this is no tragedy, to go back into the community that you came from, or the kind of work you came from, I don't know of any tragedy and I keep pretty close to the people there. Not one. And I ask my honourable friend not to use this as a reason for introducing the pension, because I can say to him that I do not know of any case whatever of a member of the government who was in that position, and if there is some one of the private members other than our group, I'd just be interested in hearing about it.

In the hopes that my honourable friend will be back in later, I'll change to another subject and

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, if the honourable member wishes a question at this point I have one. I would like to ask him if he would tell us as plainly and sincerely as he can, as he undoubtedly can, does he think that \$63.00 a month for a member who is 55 years old and who has served eight years is too high? Does he think that a pension of \$100.00 a month for somebody who has been here 12 years and who is 55 or over is too high? And finally, is he aware that his own colleagues have said that they are in favour of the principle, which I understand he is not?

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, I am quite aware, I am quite aware, Mr. Chairman, that several of my own colleagues have said that they are in favour of the principle of a pension for members of the Legislative Assembly and Cabinet Ministers. I say I'm not. This is quite understandable. Call me old-fashioned, or if my honourable friend from Mines and Natural Resources were here, call me a dinosaur if he wishes; call me what you like; but this happens to be my opinion. And my leader here doesn't suggest to me that I even sit away off in a back seat or anything like that because of holding an opinion of my own. Our group is -- some of them are much more progressive in their attitude than I, but we are 100 percent in agreement on this question that even those who are quite in favour of the principle of a pension, are determined, are convinced that it should receive more consideration than it has up to this time and that it should go to a committee outside the House so that the public is

Now as far as the level of the pension, I must confess that I have not even checked the bill. I'm not very good at mathematics and computations anyway, and I'm not personally interested, and I have not even checked the bill as to the pensions payable. I'm going to ask my honourable friend the Minister who sponsored this bill if he will give me some figures on that, because I would rather get his figures than my own. I have not ever checked that, and I'm not interested in what the level is, because I don't agree with the principle of part-time employment, so whether it's high or low is of no interest whatever to me because it's the principle that I'm dealing with and I will come, a little later on though, to the question of some figures.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q. C. (St. John's): May I interrupt the honourable member, and ask him -- he said that he was not in favour of the principle for part-time employment. Is

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) he then in favour of the principle for full-time ministerial employment?

MR. CAMPBELL: No. No, because there's two qualifications, and if my honourable friend from St. John's had listened to me as carefully as he should, so that he would become instructed in a logical presentation of this subject, he would have heard me say that in my opinion there are two - - two prerequisites: permanent employment and full-time employment. The two. And I maintain that the cabinet minister's post is not permanent. It lasts a little while until the public catch on to them, but I pointed out the other day that the evidence that -- how ephemeral it is, how fleeting is that existence, is the fact that more than half of the present members of the cabinet were not in the original cabinet when this government took office. So they don't meet that test of permanency, permanent employment and full-time employment, so I'm not in favour of either one. Incidentally, when I'm talking about the present cabinet half of them not being in the original one, reminds me of the story of the Irishman who was being very critical of a council, and he said half of this council were rogues. The chairman of council quite properly called him to order and said that's not admissible, and the Irishman said, "Well all right then, I'll change it around and I'll say half of them aren't rogues," so half of this cabinet wasn't in the original cabinet. Now, if I've answered my honourable friend's question - - not satisfactorily to him, of course because he doesn't agree with me and that's his privilege, but this is my point of view and I still stay with it. I'll take a chance now since I've got on the other, of my honourable friend not escaping from me again. I'll go ahead with where I'd started. You're going to stay? Good.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, I think you should tell my honourable friend that the call I was answering was even more persuasive than his.

MR. CAMPBELL: Well I'm glad to see that my honourable friend has some associations that he's very fond of. I must tell him that we miss him in here though while he's attending to the others.

I've made it plain to my honourable friend the Minister who sponsors this bill that not everybody in the House is in favour of the principles because there's at least one exception, and I have looked at the bill or listened to the discussions sufficiently to be sure of this, that there are two things that I think are basic in this pension legislation. One is the minimum length of service, because there is a minimum and this is right. If there's going to be such legislation, this corresponds with my ideas. The minimum I take it is eight sessions. I'd, of course, think it should be longer but it's eight sessions. Now what I'd like to ask my honourable friend the Minister to tell me, and I'm sure he has this information so I'd appreciate it if he would give it to us in his reply - just as soon as possible so we can have it before us, and I feel happy in asking the questions of the Honourable Minister because he's not one of the ministers that is personally qualified at the present time. He's one who isn't eligible for a pension at the moment, so I'm not asking him about his personal affair in this way. Has this minimum been achieved by the 1958 group in the House? I take it that it has already been achieved by those of us who came in in 1958 and are still here. If it hasn't, then I've made a wrong computation right off the bat. I'm inclined to think, Mr. Chairman, that the eight year minimum has been achieved by the 1959 group of members, and I'd like the Honourable the Minister who's in charge of the bill to tell me this, because as I look at the sessions it seems to me that even the 1958 group is already qualified.

MR. STEINKOPF: Would you like those answers before you . . .

MR. CAMPBELL: No, I'd prefer to get them from my honourable friend later if he'd just make a note of them. But if they're not then I assume that they would qualify in the next year. Then the maximum pension - I think this is clear, that it's 70 percent of the average indemnity. I would suggest that the terms should be a little longer if we're going to have a pension bill. I would suggest ten years and three elections, rather than the present; and then I'd like to know in connection with the pension if my honourable friend the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources has reported to the House on the check that he undertook to make on the figures that he gave with regard to the Federal bill. Did he give us correct information or has he found on review that that was incorrect? I thought it was incorrect on the basis of his own figures, and if it was, then that just shows you, Mr. Chairman, how difficult it is to make these computations if such a skilled mathematician as my honourable friend would have given us the wrong information.

And then I'd like, Mr. Chairman, to ask the Honourable the Minister to answer a few

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd) . . . more questions for me. What is the maximum pension available to a cabinet minister who qualifies on the 8-year term under the situation as it exists now? What is the maximum pension to the others who are covered by the bill? I don't feel at all hesitant in asking these questions of the Honourable the Minister because I'm sure that in the work that's gone into this bill that they have covered these questions and that they have them before them.

Then I did want to comment on the remarks of my honourable friend the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources when he suggested that the former government was niggling and niggardly, if I caught his words correctly. I'm glad that one of his colleagues this afternoon paid the former government the compliment of saying that he thought they did a reasonably good job during the time it was here, but my honourable friend the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources seldom if ever misses an opportunity to exercise his command of language, vitriolic language, on the former government, and I want to tell my honourable friend that when he's talking about the former government being niggardly and niggling that I wish he'd go out and tell the average taxpayer of the Province of Manitoba what he is suggesting in this pension plan. I wish he'd go out and tell a public meeting in his own constituency or in mine - and I'd be delighted to be present at either one of them with him - and have him tell any public meeting any place in this province, that he considers that I'm a niggardly and niggling person because of the way that I have acted during the years that I've been in this House, and I wish he would go to the people of the Province of Manitoba, and I don't care what part of the province it is, and explain to them that this is an affluent society as he told us the other day; that this is an affluent society that he thinks should be quite prepared to pay to him after the length of service that he has given in public affairs the amount of pension that he is already qualified for, if my figuring is correct. I'd like him to tell that to them and to explain to them some of these facts and figures and data that have already been put on the record in this House about the income of a lot of people in the Province of Manitoba.

When he suggests that this is an affluent society that we're operating in, this must be true for a large group of the people of Manitoba. For a great many people of Manitoba it's an affluent society. It's a pretty affluent society for the fellow who sits in the cabinet seat over there and looks out from one of those comfortable chairs on the rest of the world and with a \$17,000-plus backing him up, but let him go to this large proportion of people in the Province of Manitoba who have an average salary that is lower than the indemnity that we get here. The average wage earner in the Province of Manitoba does not make as much money as the indemnity that we're paid here, and I'm not using "indemnity" in the term that it's used in the pension bill; I'm using it in the sense of the full \$4,800.00. The average salary of the wage earner in the Province of Manitoba is something like three-quarters of that amount, and the ARDA statistics that were compiled from the 1961 census returns tell us that in the Province of Manitoba one-quarter -- one-quarter of the farm families sells less than \$2,500 worth of produce. One-quarter of them, less than 2,500 for the whole family to live on; and even the percentage of rural non-farm families with an annual income below \$3,000 - and this is a whole family - 48 percent in the Province of Manitoba. And let my honourable friend who wants to qualify for a pension on this basis go out and tell them that this is an affluent society.

There are other figures here that I could give including one that comes from the - - and again I quote from the Manitoba Economic Consultative Board report, which I have found to be very useful and entertaining this year, and I would suggest that my honourable friends become better acquainted with it than they are because if they look on Page 38 they will find a note that Professor Firestone has estimated that 20 percent of our population in 1961 was at or below the poverty level, etc. So when my honourable friend talks about people being niggardly and niggling and living in the dinosaur age and expressions of this kind, and that we have an affluent society here and that you should catch up with it, I say to my honourable friend: you're away ahead of us in your position here to talk to people in those terms.

But what was the other reason that my honourable friend was so emphatic in his support of this legislation? It was to get good men in here. Get good men in here - that's what he wants. Well this always does interest and intrigue me to hear the people who are already in here saying, "Let's get good men in here." We came in here under these conditions. And my honourable friend from St. Vital has admitted on behalf of himself and one other that he knows there are better men than in their constituencies, but we're not all prepared to make that admission, I hope. I hope not. I am sure that if there's one person in here that wouldn't make that admission it's my honourable friend the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. There might

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd) be somebody who would break down and have a fit of modesty but it wouldn't be my honourable friend, I can assure you. Not he. But this is what he wants; to get good men in here.

He tells us, Mr. Chairman, he says he's been up and down the length and breadth of this country, asking people to accept a position in public life, and what do they do? They ask about salary and pension. Well now my honourable friend from Emerson has already dealt briefly with this matter this afternoon, and I can corroborate completely what he has said because I believe that I've had as much experience as my honourable friend the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources in talking to people about considering public life as a vocation or avocation, and I can say with mathematical exactitude, Mr. Chairman, that I have never once had one single person raise that question at me. I can say, with the Honourable Member for Emerson, that many of them didn't know what the indemnity was and usually they didn't even ask. I have never once, never, had anyone ask about either the salary or the pension, and I disagree completely with what my honourable friend has said, because I do not believe that those are the reasons for which people come into this House. I figure that in these different areas what my honourable friend has been talking about is plain unadulterated nonsense when he says that the reason these people are not here is because they can't afford to be.

The honourable the sponsor of the bill says that he was actually happy to bring in this bill. Well he may have been happy bringing in the bill, Mr. Chairman, but he became unhappy very soon after, because he followed right on the heels of this bill with a pretty substantial amendment. And if it was studied for so long and so carefully, I would wonder that such a substantive amendment would have been brought in so soon. The Minister also says that there are many unknowns in this situation. I recognize that, and I agree with him. There are many unknowns. But Mr. Chairman, there are some fundamentals that are known. This affluent society that my honourable friend the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources talks about is not an affluent society for a great many of the people of Manitoba. The Financial Post market survey gives added evidence of the fact that many people, many people in Manitoba have a very low income, and these are the people, these are the people, Mr. Chairman, that we're asking to pay this pension, the people that will have to pay their portion of this pension if we put it into effect.

It's true of course, Mr. Chairman, that it's not a large percentage of the annual expenditure of this province. If you take the current and the capital expenditure together, that we have already authorized in this session, it amounts to more than \$225 million and certainly at the highest figure that my honourable friend would be likely to quote, the annual cost wouldn't look like a big portion of that huge expenditure. But Mr. Chairman, I still say, it's the principle of the thing. It's the principle of we folk here voting ourselves another prerequisite, and doing it just at the end of the session and doing it without taking it into the committee.

The personal involvement is something that we can't escape here. And the reason that I've been suggesting that both indemnities and pensions, if they should come, should be dealt with by one House to come into effect only after another election and then start fresh, is because I would like to mitigate, as far as possible, that feeling of personal involvement that we all have to share here. And in the same way I would suggest that further consideration be given to this bill now, that it be sent out to a committee, which of course will mean deferring it for another year. But for goodness sake, the question that the Honourable Member for Gladstone has asked several times, what harm would be done by leaving it for another year? The only possible difference that could be made by leaving it another year would be if there should happen to be an election in the meantime. And if there should happen to be an election in the meantime, then the new Legislature could deal with the matter. It would be a good thing for them to sharpen up their teeth on and it would be a good time for them to get to work on it early in the session. So I really do urge, Mr. Chairman, that this motion be seriously considered by the government forces. I believe it to be right, I think it would be a mistake to rush this pension bill through.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I thought that I had made myself quite clear this morning. I didn't intend to speak again but I will be just a very few minutes. But there are certain things that were mentioned here today, and I was quoted, and I think it was quite wrong, out of context, and I would like to straighten out or make these few corrections.

First of all, I tried to make it very clear that we would discuss - there was more than one thing to study. There was the question of principle, principle of the pension, and then even if we adopted the principle was it advisable to implement this, to make this legislation at this

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) time? And then what kind of plan? And I think those are very important things that are three different items.

Now the Honourable Member from Brokenhead must feel that we're wrong in saying that we want to send this to the committee. He also gave us an example - and he felt that I wasn't too happy about a certain motion or bill that I'd prepared and that was sent to a committee - and he's right. And he feels then why don't - because if this meant more study - why don't I follow the same pattern here. Well first of all, that the certain committee, the way the motion reads - it's been done in the past - this will be studied again. You don't hear anything about it and it's exactly not to study it so nothing will be done. And this here, the reason for not sending it to committee because we don't want the people to make representation. But even if you don't believe this, if you don't agree with it, I would say that it's right if we were dealing with the question of principle only. I say it's true, when he says this has been before us for a number of years, this question of pensions. If we had a pension here, we want to approve the principle of pension - nothing else, I would say, right, this is our responsibility; we don't have to go to committee; we'll decide now.

I would say that from what I see all the members of the Conservative Party as well as those of the NDP would be in favour of the principle. I know that my honourable friend who just spoke would be against. There might be the odd one in this party who would be against, and I will not try to hide behind this. Just the principle by itself. No, I would be inclined to go for it because I agree with some of the things, a lot of the things that were said. I think it might not be a bad idea to have a pension. As I say, normally. But now, we have to decide why we're rushed; we want it now, now, now. I say this is not the time when we've got these taxes. No member of the NDP - the member from Brokenhead has quoted me quite a bit; he hasn't said a word about this. These are the people that want us to make the people of Manitoba believe that they're the only ones interested in the small man. They haven't said a word about this. This is the point that I'm talking about. I'm not arguing against the principle of pensions. I probably would favour it, but not at this time. If we would just adopt this here, the Member from Brokenhead would be right, let's decide now; we've been talking about this for a long time.

But this is not what we want to send to a committee. We can make up our mind about the principle. We want to know if this is fair to the people of Manitoba to do it now, and we want to know if this plan is fair. And this plan is not fair. And if the Member from Brokenhead wants to be fair and wants to quote me, he should quote what he knows I mean. He stood up here and he said, how many times, that as far as he was concerned, \$64.00 - you couldn't live on that. I agree with him. And I don't think this is unfair and I think I said that. I said that two days ago. Let's be fair. Now even if he stayed 15 sessions, even if he stayed 15 sessions at \$120.00, I wouldn't think that this was out of line. All right, there I go. But let's go; let's stay with me and I'll go some more. I say that the Cabinet Ministers' pension is unfair. I say that after eight sessions you could live on \$314.00 a month. I say that \$588.00 for 15 sessions is too much for those friends in front of me. That's what I say. That's the only thing that I'm saying. I said that this was a thing tailored for the Cabinet Minister, and I repeat this. I have said that this was callous and I repeat this. And I would like to see the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources come in and defend this position. I would like to see that.

Now what we want to go to committee is not the principle, it's the plan. And we found a lot of things wrong. We're always thrown this - they're always coming back with this, "Well, this is done here and this is done there." But we're only talking about other politicians. I don't know of any other place that they decide - the people themselves, the employees - decides what kind of pension they'll get. And I'm not ready to accept because it's done in Ottawa, it's right; or because it's done in Ontario, it's right, and that should close the matter; we're mere rubber stamps. It's done here; we should do the same thing. If this is what they're doing out there, I don't care where it is, as far as I'm concerned it's wrong -- \$588.00 after 15 sessions is away too much. It's out of line. And I say that this thing was ill-conceived; it was done without proper preparation.

Let me give you another example. I give you an example first of all, and some of the things we said; we have this big amendment. Didn't they realize what this meant before? Didn't we realize that they could go after eight years? Oh you show the square of the card. But I'm going to tell you something else. You didn't answer my question this morning. You didn't answer my question that somebody could start collecting before they've paid a cent. You haven't answered that. Answer this. This is what we want studied by people that know what they're doing. This is the kind of plan - the plan we want to study, not the principle. We're ready to make up

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) our mind on the principle now. The plan. If I was to follow the line of reasoning of my honourable friend that since we - all right, we've set the principle therefore here, you do what you want. A thousand dollars a month? Fine, we accepted the principle; we don't have to look at it because we've been talking about this principle for 60 years. Two thousand dollars a month? That's fine. I say that this plan is not realistic and I say it's unfair. Now there's another thing. Let's say that a Cabinet Minister - I know this doesn't happen too often - stays in for the full time, at the same salary, of 24 sessions. He qualifies for the maximum of 10, 990 or \$915 pension a month. But if after those 24 years as a Cabinet Minister his government is defeated and he stays on as an ordinary MLA or if he resigns and stays on as an ordinary MLA. You know what happens? He's stayed the same amount of 24 sessions but he wants to give further contribution, like my honourable friend did - well his salary is average, and instead of getting this \$915 pension a month he gets \$859 because he spent another two years helping, he gets a lower salary. They might say well maybe this is not it because you've reached the top. Maybe they'll bring another amendment. But this is not clear. These are things that could happen. You give another two years after giving 24 years of time. Your salary will be reduced because your average is not as high, so instead of for the rest of your life getting 915 you'll get 859 and you'll collect for two years less. All right, he shakes his head, he says no. Maybe there's something that says in there that once you've reached you don't pay any more and you're entitled to the maximum. But it's not clear to me. This is why we want it in committee. But can he shake his head when I say this, this man that quits then gets \$915 and he can still be fairly young; he can go and be the president in another company which is done pretty often, and get a good salary; he still gets this 915 a month. But the other man who figures that he has a further contribution to make, he will stay this full two years. He's not collecting a cent during that time. He's not collecting a cent but he'll stay and instead of getting this \$915 a month he's staying here and what does he get? Thirty-six hundred dollars for the year. Doesn't he? -- (Interjection) -- All right. Well I'll try. You shook your head at the other one, we'll talk about something else. If this person is a Cabinet Minister for 24 years, he's reached his maximum -- not 24 years but 24 sessions - he's reached his maximum of 70 percent of his salary of 15, 700 or 10, 990, and he gets -- (Interjection) -- well let me finish, then you'll ask a question.

MR. STEINKOPF: You're on a different, wrong premise and it will save a lot of time if you're interested.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, I'd like to present it my way. I'm not too sharp - maybe I won't understand. This person is getting, after he resigns \$915. maximum pension a month - right? When he resigns he gets \$915 a month which is maximum. He leaves, he's out of the House, he'll get a job as president of some little outfit, and so on, he can get some more money there, but he still gets this \$915 a month.

All right. Now the second man. He's also in the same Cabinet. He's been there also 24 years. He's made the same contributions - they came together - he's the same age. He's also entitled to \$915.83 a month. But he's induced by the people in his constituency - they feel that he's been doing a good job, they ask him why don't you stay another term? He's elected. It doesn't matter if his party is the winning side or not but he doesn't want to be a Cabinet Minister any more. He can not collect because he is a member. He doesn't collect. He's no longer a Cabinet Minister. He receives \$3600.00. He's giving more contribution, he's put in as much, instead of getting his \$915 pension for doing nothing, he'll get \$3200 for staying here as an MLA. That's not right? Well, all right then I will - I've got very little to say and then I'll let you explain this because I don't see it. I don't see it in here. I don't see anywhere they say, as far as I'm concerned, if you're an MLA you can't collect.

And I say - and I'm not sure if the Honourable Member for Brokenhead was here all this time, but I say it's not that \$64 that I'm worrying about. I'm with you 100 percent on this. And it's not even that \$120, it's 588 so if you think I'm wrong on that tell me this but I agree with the principle of this thing and I think that it's not the same thing when we decide only a principle. I'd agree also with my honourable friend that we decide here. But we've got a plan to study, we've got to find out if we should do it now. And the only thing in favour of this that I've heard is because it's done in Ottawa or in another province, and I can't buy that. If that is unjust here, I feel that it's unjust there. The main thing that I'm complaining about is I think that it is too high a pension for Cabinet Ministers. I think the maximum is too high and I certainly felt before this amendment that this was not such a good idea to start collecting a pension,

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) . . . \$314 for the rest of your life at age 38. Now I think that we should try to find out what we agree with.

MR. STEINKOPF: Mr. Chairman, on the one case, I think it can be fairly easily explained in the fact that the bill is in two parts - one part for the members and the other part for the -- it's actually in three parts, but the second part for the Cabinet Ministers, and the Leader of the Opposition and the Speaker, and refers to special cases.

Now in the second case that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface referred to and say that it was my case, that I'd been here 24 years, I'll then be 74 years of age and I can well understand how it'd be a little tough to come back into the House and take on the responsibility of a Cabinet Minister, but it might not be too tough to be to sit here in the back bench and listen to the speeches and while away my old age here. The amount of money, the pension that the person would have been entitled to draw as a Cabinet Minister would be paid, even though he wasn't sitting here -- say that the figure was \$12,500 -- he could get a pension up to 70 percent of the \$12,500 and then would only be contributing to the pension for the \$3,200, the ordinary member's annual salary.

MR. DESJARDINS: . . . If there's an election now, and let's say well in two or three years when most of these Cabinet Ministers qualify, and let's say that -- it probably will happen -- the part is defeated. None of them are any longer Cabinet Ministers but they are MLAs. They get their pension as a Cabinet Minister then?

MR. STEINKOPF: Yes . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Well that's another thing we should study then. That brings another point.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Chairman, I've heard some talk today, much muttering and seen some wringing of hands in the halls and the coffee room. We could all be home. We could all be home if those mean Liberals would sit down and shut up. We could all be home with our pension plan. Well, I would like to ask, Mr. Chairman, what vital business are we holding up by discussing this important matter? True, there's one important bill still in committee, Bill 141, to do with Shared Services. We know that the government majority will carry this bill and it'll be implemented in some manner next September. There are a few other bills that are of no importance as far as time goes, so the only time we are taking up here at this time is our own time. So I say to those people that are crying the blues and wanting to go home with their pension under their arm, it's just too bad, because we're not going to accommodate you quite that easily.

Now there was some remark made by the Minister earlier in the day that they were just going to sit it out, and as soon as we stopped talking well then they were going to put it through and then everything would be fine. Well I think my honourable friend knows by now that we are not a rubber stamp opposition and we never will be. My friends on my left, or the NDP, can speak for themselves; how they act is up to them and I say nothing about that but if the Honourable Minister thinks that we're just going to

MR. SCHREYER: Is the honourable member suggesting that we're rubber stamps?

MR. JOHNSTON: I made no reference to the NDP as rubber stamping. So I would say to the Minister perhaps I can correct his thinking a little bit, that we are certainly going to discuss this as long as we feel we should and there have been points brought up today that the Minister can't answer or if he can, he hasn't answered us.

MR. STEINKOPF: Mr. Chairman, could you give me an example?

MR. JOHNSTON: Yes. One of the questions asked was, what would happen if this plan was delayed for one year in a House committee? You didn't answer that question.

MR. STEINKOPF: I did. You may not have liked the answer.

MR. JOHNSTON: Well you haven't given us the answer. You've avoided it. It's been asked about six times during the course of the debate. Another question that was asked was, why was this delayed till the very last, till the very last day or two.

MR. STEINKOPF: Mr. Chairman, that was answered. Where've you been all day?

MR. JOHNSTON: I'll come to that later as to why I think the reason that you left it till the last day or two. Then after, when he did attempt to answer that question he had to backtrack a little bit - I said attempt - well then if you're all so all-fired sure the bill was so perfect, why did you amend it after a couple of hours debate. Answer that one. Because you knew that you'd gone too far, that's why.

MR. STEINKOPF: But they were answered. Be factual.

MR. JOHNSTON: Why did you make the amendment then? Did you not think that you had

(MR. JOHNSTON cont'd) gone too far? If this bill could stand the light of day, what is your objection to letting it go to the committee of the House? No, you want to rush it through in the last day or two. If it was a good bill, perhaps with some corrections in the committee it would go through, if everybody's in agreement with the principle.

I'll tell you why I think it was this bill wasn't mentioned in the Throne Speech, because the Honourable the First Minister had something to say about another pension plan in his Throne Speech and it would look very awkward to be knocking one and mentioning this munificent pension plan for the Cabinet Ministers on the next page in the same speech, wouldn't it?

Well, I am certainly not going to go home from this session and have to answer the questions or to hear the remark - I see that you fellows have pushed through a nice pension plan for yourselves in the last day or two. And I'm making my voice heard on this and I'm supporting the view that this bill should be sent to a committee of the House. There's no valid reason for not doing this, for taking another year on it. The only reason is it doesn't suit the 12 apostles over there who are going to be the benefactors in a large measure.

Actually I was glad to see the Member from Brokenhead get up and start to add some constructive thoughts later in the afternoon. Up until that point I believe that was the first constructive mention that was made on this bill from his group. Before that they were just about as all-fired rushed to get this through as the Conservatives were. Now I'd like to refer to Hansard and give you some of my reasons, or quote as what I think is the reason that this wasn't mentioned in the Throne Budget Speech by the First Minister, and I'm on Page 224 and the First Minister is giving those Liberals the dickens about their hollering about the heat tax and so on. And what does he have to say and I'll quote: "But the average man is going to be paying something like 60 cents a month for this cruel heartless abominable unconscionable heat tax. Well I want to say, oh, my foes and my friends, if you are disturbed about this, wait till the Canada Pension Plan hits the tax paying public, wait on this." So a member speaks out, "Are you for it or against it?" Mr. Roblin: "I'm going to talk about the Canada Pension Plan and you'll know where I stand before I get through. I'm going to come clean on this particular subject." I don't know what the connotation is there - and I start again: "And I'm going to tell you that under the Canada Pension Plan everybody earning over \$600 a year will pay. If you are a man earning 3,600 a year and you are self-employed, you will be paying \$108.00. You will be paying more in one month to the Canada Pension Plan than you pay for the whole year in this offensive and abominable tax on heat." And he goes on talking about it, and further down, in the next paragraph, he's speaking now of health insurance and medical insurance. He says: "Medical health insurance, that's left out in the cold because this is going to come in first - - where the money is coming from for the health insurance heaven only knows. The needs of education are going to be left out in the cold. A system of forced saving is being brought in, and let me say the system of forced saving is quite unnecessary for the purposes of the Canada Pension Plan."

Well if I may digress for a moment, I can hardly blame the First Minister for making that remark that in his opinion, he comes to that conclusion, when they had a pension like this laying in their office waiting to bring it in in the last days. He said: "Now let me give you some information about what the Province of Manitoba thinks about the Canada Pension Plan. First of all I've got to say this to you frankly. Our options are limited. I am not going to make any bones about it. We've got two choices. If the plan passes we may accept it as it passes from the federal government or we may contract out. But, and here's the kicker, if we contract out we must bring in a plan of our own with substantially the same benefits. Clearly a Hobson's choice." I wonder, when he made that expression Hobson's choice, was he thinking of the members' pension plan here too. I'm for the principle, I make no bones about it. "We have reservations about the effect of the Canada Pension Plan on our provincial tax rolls and consequently on our ability to finance the other needs of equal or higher priority." Then further down he speaks of the alternative needs of education and health. "The new investments that are needed in education are staggering and must perhaps be given the highest priority."

So I'm suggesting that's why what I call the MCPP, the Manitoba Conservative Pension Plan, wasn't mentioned in the Throne Speech because it wouldn't stand much scrutiny alongside the remarks of the First Minister in this regard.

So what are people saying about this outside the House? And I'm going to quote now an editorial from the Tribune and the Minister who introduced the legislation has complained somewhat bitterly that there has been some misinformation printed and he's done his best to try and correct this. I say to him, why didn't he supply the information? Why doesn't he have a

(MR. JOHNSTON cont'd) table of figures that can be referred to? But we didn't get that. So in the Tribune of Wednesday, May 5th, there's a small item on the editorial page and it's called, "Some twins are more equal, a tale of twin brothers. At age 22 one ran on a youth platform for the legislature and won but at age 30, after eight years in the House, he was defeated. He applies for his MLA pension to be paid under the terms of Bill 110. He found he was entitled to a lifetime pension beginning at age 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 had paid as a young politician had been only 1,536.

MR. PAULLEY: interrupt my honourable friend but I believe the rules of the House say that we should cease at 5:30 unless you can't see the clock, and this has been done in the past. I recall it quite vividly where the speaker of the day says, "I can't see any clock, that there is," and this was under the former administration, and there's none so blind as those that won't see, but anyway Mr. Chairman, it seems to me as though it is 25 minutes to six. I'm interested in the comments that are being made by the Honourable Member for Portage and if we are going to meet this evening and as far as I'm personally concerned I think we should, I would suggest that you may consider -- I'm not making a motion because I know what happens to motions of this nature in this Legislature -- I'm just suggesting that you possibly might call it 5:30, leave the Chair and come back this evening at which time the Honourable Member for Portage will have three or four hours to continue his dissertation.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I think it is as my honourable friend says past the hour so we should consider rising. I think probably the best idea is simply to ask the Chairman to leave the Chair and we'll continue our discussions at 8:00 o'clock.

MR. MORRIS GRAY (Inkster): Before we adjourn, we won't finish tonight anyway, why not adjourn until Monday to give us at least one evening a week to get a rest.

MR. ROBLIN: Well I'm always an optimist Mr. Chairman, but -- I'm always an optimist. You have to be in this business.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, what did the speed-up resolution call for?

MR. PAULLEY: 5:30.

MR. FROESE: 5:30. So I think we should abide by it.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, if you'll leave the Chair, we'll continue at 8:00 o'clock.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I call it 5:30 and I leave the Chair until 8:00 o'clock.