

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

9:30 o'clock, Saturday, May 8th, 1965.

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions
 Reading and Receiving Petitions
 Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees
 Notices of Motion
 Introduction of Bills
 Orders of the Day

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Madam Speaker, if there are no questions before the Orders of the Day, I would propose the same procedure as we followed last night, that you should leave the Chair until the Law Amendments Committee has completed its labours.

MADAM SPEAKER: I leave the Chair until Law Amendments Committee adjourns.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN (Attorney-General) (Dauphin): proceedings of the day, the presentation of reports by Standing and Special Committees, may I have leave of the House to present the 10th Report of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments.

MR. CLERK: Your Special Committee on Law Amendments beg leave to present the following as their 10th Report. Your Committee has considered Bills: No. 93, an Act to validate By-law No. 3739 of the City of Brandon; No. 125, an Act to authorize the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources to Transfer certain lands to The City of Transcona; No. 126, an Act to amend Certain Provisions of the Statute Law and to correct certain Typographical Errors in the Statutes; No. 131, an Act respecting the Flag of Manitoba; No. 133, an Act to amend an Act to incorporate "The Interior Trust Company"; No. 134, an Act to incorporate Canadian Lutheran World Relief; No. 135, an Act to establish the Manitoba Arts Council; No. 137, an Act to amend The Metropolitan Winnipeg Act (3); No. 138, an Act to incorporate The Manitoba Association of School Trustees; No. 139, an Act to amend The Education Department Act and The Public Schools Act (1); and has agreed to report the same without amendment.

Your Committee has also considered Bills: No. 128, an Act to provide a Charter for The City of St. Vital; No. 129, an Act to provide a Charter for The City of Transcona; No. 132, an Act respecting the Taxation of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company by The City of Winnipeg and to amend The Winnipeg Charter, 1956; No. 136, an Act to incorporate The Brandon Area Foundation; No. 141, an Act to amend The Education Department Act and The Public Schools Act (2); and has agreed to report the same with certain amendments.

Your Committee also recommends that the Fees paid in connection with the following bills be refunded, less the costs of printing: No. 134, an Act to incorporate Canadian Lutheran World Relief; and No. 136, an Act to incorporate The Brandon Area Foundation. All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Education, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. McLEAN: With leave, and following the report, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Education, that the fees paid in connection with the following bills be refunded less the costs of printing: No. 134, an Act to incorporate Canadian Lutheran World Relief; and No. 136, an Act to incorporate The Brandon Area Foundation.

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Lakeside, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: 1. The number of so-called "special schools" or "schools in undeveloped settlements" in Manitoba. 2. The name and location of each of these schools. 3. Which of these schools provide high school education. 4. The attendance at each of these schools each year since 1960 broken down into elementary and high school attendance. 5. Which

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd)..... of these schools have been integrated into the regular Division School System. 6. The number of students from these types of schools who have been integrated into the Division School System. 7. The number of students from schools under the Department of Indian Affairs who have been integrated into: (a) the regular elementary school system, and (b) the Division School System in each year since 1960.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for St. George.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Gladstone, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: 1. How many firms tendered on Project 927 of the Department of Public Works. 2. What prices were submitted by each firm. 3. What firm was awarded the contract. 4. How much money was paid by the government to the firm awarded the contract. 5. Whether the firm awarded the contract completed the work. 6. If not, the reason why the above firm did not complete the work. 7. The name of the firm that did complete the work on this contract. 8. Whether this firm tendered for the job. 9. How much money was paid to the contractor finishing the job.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for St. George.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Gladstone, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: The amount of money committed to pre-season bidding over and above the current year's program, by the Department of Public Works for highway construction at September 30, December 31, and March 31 of each year since 1959.

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

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Education, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the resolution standing in my name and as it is printed in the Order Paper.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole with the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor having been informed of the subject matter of the resolution recommends it to the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion before the Committee reads as follows:.....

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, as the Resolution is printed in full in the Votes and Proceedings, could we dispense with the reading because it is a purely informal motion.

MR. DOUGLAS L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Chairman, not only in the Votes and Proceedings but in Hansard.--(Interjection)--Thank you.

(The following is the resolution referred to.)

WHEREAS the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba at its Fourth Session of the 27th Legislature, pursuant to Rule 67 of the Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceedings of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, appointed a Standing Committee of the House on Statutory Regulations and Orders on Friday, the 12th day of March, 1965;

AND WHEREAS the members of the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders consist of Honourable Messrs. Lyon, McLean, Smellie, Steinkopf, Messrs. Campbell, Cowan, Froese, Groves, Molgat, Mills, Schreyer, Shewman and Wright;

AND WHEREAS the Legislative Assembly on the 8th day of March, 1965 gave second reading to Bill (No. 29) - An Act to amend The Garnishment Act, and referred it to the Standing Committee on Law Amendments, and by order of the House on the 6th day of April, 1965 Bill (No. 29) was withdrawn from the Standing Committee on Law Amendments and referred to the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders;

AND WHEREAS the Legislative Assembly on the 13th day of April, 1965, gave second reading to Bill (No. 74) - An Act to amend the Judgments Act, and referred same to the Standing

Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders;

AND WHEREAS the Legislative Assembly on the 4th day of May, 1965 passed a resolution section 24 of Bill (No. 119) - An Act to amend The Mortgage Act to the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders for consideration and report;

AND WHEREAS the Legislative Assembly on the 22nd day of April, 1965 adopted the following resolution:

WHEREAS The Law Society of Manitoba has for some time made, and continues to make, provisions for assistance in certain legal matters to be given, without charge, to certain needy persons;

AND WHEREAS the Government has for some years made provision for retaining, at the public expense, of counsel for the defence of persons charged with certain offences who are themselves unable, by reason of lack of funds, to retain such counsel;

AND WHEREAS it has been suggested that, although the value of the provision now made by The Law Society and the Government as aforesaid is acknowledged, some citizens of the province may still be handicapped in maintaining, enforcing, or defending their legal rights by reason of being unable, through lack of adequate financial resources, to obtain legal advice and assistance;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders appointed at this Session do inquire and report to the House

(a) as to the extent and adequacy of the provision now made by The Law Society and the Government for the furnishing of free legal aid and advice to needy persons;

(b) as to the extent to which needy persons in Manitoba may still be handicapped in maintaining, enforcing, or defending their legal rights by reason of being unable, through lack of funds, to obtain legal advice and assistance;

(c) as to the measures, if any, that should be put in force by way of legislation or otherwise, to ensure that no citizen is handicapped in respect of the matters hereinbefore mentioned.

AND WHEREAS the Legislative Assembly on the 1st day of May, 1965, adopted the following resolution:

WHEREAS it is advisable to consider ways and means of safeguarding the rights of individual citizens vis-a-vis the State;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders appointed at this Session do inquire into a report to the House

1. on the guarantees and safeguards which are available to a citizen when administrative authorities make decisions, not subject to judicial review or to other like appeals, that affect the rights and interests of the citizens;
2. as to what measures, if any, it deems necessary to ensure that the rights and interests of the citizens will be secure when dealing with administrative authorities; and
3. on whether an official should be appointed who would:
 - (a) inquire into cases where it is alleged to him that a board, commission, or other agency of the government, or an employee in the public service of the government, or of any such board, commission, or agency or any other administrative authority has made arbitrary or unreasonable decisions, or made mistakes, or committed acts of negligence not subject to judicial review or other like appeal in the discharge of its or his duties and functions; and
 - (b) report to the House at each session respecting any such cases with his observations thereon and recommendations with respect thereto; and

With particular reference to the immediately preceding sections, the Committee is specifically authorized to report upon

- (a) whether the appointment of such an official is compatible with our system of parliamentary democracy, including the principle of ministerial responsibility; and
- (b) whether the attempted integration of the office and duties of such an official with the political institutions and customs that are now imbedded in and form a part of, our constitution, would be wise.

AND WHEREAS the House deems it advisable that Bill (No. 29) - An Act to amend the Garnishment Act, Bill (No. 74) - An Act to amend The Judgment Act, and section 24 of Bill

(No. 119) - An Act to amend The Mortgage Act, be referred to the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders for consideration and report, and the said Committee do inquire, consider and report to this House with respect to the two above mentioned resolutions;

AND WHEREAS it is deemed advisable that this Committee sit during the present session and in recess after prorogation to hear representations with respect to these bills and the said resolutions;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders appointed at the Fourth Session of the 27th Legislature on Friday, the 12th day of March, 1965, consisting of Honourable Messrs. Lyon, McLean, Smellie, Steinkopf, Messrs. Campbell, Cowan, Groves, Molgat, Schreyer, Wright, Froese, Mills and Shewman do:

1. Consider and hear representations and report with respect to Bill (No. 29) - An Act to amend The Garnishment Act, Bill (No. 74) - An Act to amend The Judgment Act, and section 24 of Bill (No. 119) - An Act to amend The Mortgage Act.

2. Inquire, consider and hear representations with respect to the following resolutions adopted by the Legislative Assembly at the Fourth Session of the 27th Legislature:

WHEREAS The Law Society of Manitoba has for some time made, and continue to make, provisions for assistance in certain legal matters to be given, without charge, to certain needy persons;

AND WHEREAS the Government has for some years made provision for retaining, at the public expense, of counsel for the defence of persons charged with certain offences who are themselves unable, by reason of lack of funds, to retain such counsel;

AND WHEREAS it has been suggested that, although the value of the provision now made by The Law Society and the Government as aforesaid is acknowledged, some citizens of the province may still be handicapped in maintaining, enforcing, or defending their legal rights by reason of being unable, through lack of adequate financial resources, to obtain legal advice and assistance;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders appointed at this Session do inquire and report to the House

(a) as to the extent and adequacy of the provision now made by The Law Society and the Government for the furnishing of free legal aid and advice to needy persons;

(b) as to the extent to which needy persons in Manitoba may still be handicapped in maintaining, enforcing, or defending their legal rights by reason of being unable, through lack of funds, to obtain legal advice and assistance; and

(c) as to the measures, if any, that should be put in force by way of legislation or otherwise, to ensure that no citizen is handicapped in respect of the matters hereinbefore mentioned.

WHEREAS it is advisable to consider ways and means of safeguarding the rights of individual citizens vis-a-vis the State;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders appointed at this Session do inquire into and report to the House

1. on the guarantees and safeguards which are available to a citizen when administrative authorities make decisions, not subject to judicial review or to other like appeals, that affect the rights and interests of the citizens;
2. as to what measures, if any, it deems necessary to ensure that the rights and interests of the citizens will be secure when dealing with administrative authorities; and
3. on whether an official should be appointed who would:
 - (a) inquire into cases where it is alleged to him that a board, commission, or other agency of the government, or an employee in the public service of the government, or of any such board, commission, or agency or any other administrative authority has made arbitrary or unreasonable decisions, or made mistakes, or committed acts of negligence not subject to judicial review or other like appeal in the discharge of its or his duties and functions; and
 - (b) report to the House at each session respecting any such cases with his observations thereon and recommendations with respect thereto; and

With particular reference to the immediately preceding section, the Committee is specifically authorized to report upon

- (a) whether the appointment of such an official is compatible with our system of

parliamentary democracy, including the principle of ministerial responsibility; and

- (b) whether the attempted integration of the office and duties of such an official with the political institutions and customs that are now imbedded in and form a part of, our constitution, would be wise.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED:

THAT the said Standing Committee of the House shall have power to sit during the present Session and in recess after prorogation to hear representations, and to report to this House on the matters referred to it at the next Session of the Legislature.

AND THAT the Provincial Treasurer be authorized to pay out of the Consolidated Fund, to the members of the said Committee, the amount of expenses incurred by the members in attending the sittings of the Committee, or expenses incurred by the members in the performances of duties ordered by the Committee, in recess, after prorogation, as are approved by the Comptroller-General.

AND THAT the Provincial Treasurer be authorized to pay out of the Consolidated Fund all other expenses of a kind and nature required to assist the said Committee in carrying out the provisions of this resolution and provided the same have received the prior approval of the Treasury Board.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

MR. CHAIRMAN: Madam Speaker, the Committee has adopted a certain resolution and instructed me to report the same.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Pembina, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Education, the resolution which is printed in full in the Orders of the Day and which will appear in Hansard and in the Votes and Proceedings.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Committee of the Whole House.

MR. ROBLIN: The Chairman simply resumes the Chair, Madam Speaker, if you will permit.

MADAM SPEAKER: Will the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre please take the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 110, Section 1 --

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Chairman, I was not completely satisfied with some of the answers that I got yesterday or the day before in reply to the questions that I put to my honourable friend the Provincial Secretary.

Now I am not certain as to how they calculate that after serving eight years in the House a private member would be entitled to \$51.00 - or someone has suggested that - and how a Minister serving the exact same length of time would be entitled to \$316.00. Now that appears to me as if the Minister would be getting slightly more than 600 percent more than the private member, and he doesn't earn 600 percent more by way of salary and/or indemnity or combined. It seems to me that that should be explained.

Mr. Chairman, I'm one of the members in this House that does not go along with all this talk of sacrifice, the tremendous sacrifice that we are supposed to have made or are presently making. I don't believe -- I can't go along with all of this talk. I know that in the past great sacrifices have been made, and after all is said and done, what's wrong with that? What's wrong with that? People have been admired over the centuries and times for the sacrifices they have made without being expected to be paid for everything they've done.

I believe that when I first entered town council at Neepawa about ten years ago - ten or eleven years ago - and when I went on town council we were paid \$6.00 a meeting, and I believe it was increased that year, because if you go back even 15 years and that's only a decade and a half ago, the members on council I think were only getting \$2.00 a meeting - \$2.00 a meeting -

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd). and probably if you go back 30 years they weren't getting anything. Well, I maintain this - without reflecting one way or another on the present members of council - that they had just as good or better council members 50 years ago and 60 years ago as they have today. Neepawa I think was the first town in the province to have waterworks put in in 1910 and in 1911. Neepawa has won the "most beautiful town" award for five or six years in a row as a result of planning that was done 60 and 70 years ago by members that were paid nothing -- members that were paid nothing.

Mr. Chairman, the members opposite seem to think that people no longer should be expected to make sacrifices; people no longer should be expected to do anything at all for the public unless they're well paid or overpaid for it. I am afraid too, Mr. Chairman, that if we rush this bill through - and certainly that's what it appears that we are doing, rushing it through - with the hope and anticipation that there'll be no debate on it at all. I really believe that that's what the government had in mind, not only on this bill but two other ones that I could name. They're rushing it through in the dying days of the session hoping and praying that there would be no debate on it.

I want to ask this question, Mr. Chairman. What would happen -- what would happen if we delayed the passage of this bill until the next session? What would happen? If there is not going to be an election in the interval - in the interval - what would happen? Well I don't see any harm at all in delaying it. The very fact, Mr. Chairman, that amendments were introduced to this bill either before or after Bill 110 was laid on our desks -- gosh I don't know, Mr. Chairman, whether I got the amendments before the bill or vice versa -- but in any case it proves what? It proves that not enough consideration was given to it in the first place or there'd never have been an amendment. The amendments landed on our desks I think before there was any debate. So the people that drafted the bill must have -- their conscience must have bothered them. Someone outside must have said, "well, this is bad business," or you'd never have to introduce amendments to it.

So, Mr. Chairman, I for one am not very happy with it, and all this talk about \$20,000 a year - it is true that that may be all that it will cost the first year, but I read an article here just the other day where the late Sam Rayburn, the Speaker of the U.S. Congress I think he was, one of the last things that he asked for in Congress was a \$2 million appropriation to build a suite of offices for the 169 members of Congress - I think that's the number - and further sums as required to complete that project.

Now he asked for that in 1955. They hope that it will be opened this year, I see by a recent article in the paper. And do you know, Mr. Chairman, or does this committee know the amount of the additional sums in ten years, what it has run into - what it has run into? I'll repeat: he asked for two million plus such additional sums as may be required. The additional sums now in addition to the two million that he asked for is another \$86 million -- another \$86 million. So that proves that when you start asking for \$20,000 and such additional sums - because certainly in this one there's going to be additional sums, let's not fool ourself on this one, there's sure going to be some additional sums, it's not going to be limited to 20 thousand bucks - who knows that in ten or fifteen years hence that it will run into a pile of money.

Someone in this House, or someone or some several members of this House has suggested that it is quite possible, quite possible and quite probable that one or two or more Cabinet Ministers in their expected lifetime could collect a quarter of a million dollars - a quarter of a million dollars. Well if you had five of those people on pension and five of them with the same life expectancy, and there's no - I mean the life expectancy is getting greater with every passing generation - then you'd have five Cabinet Ministers collecting a million dollars in their lifetime.

My honourable friends opposite seem to think that they may be there for life, but it is only what - seven or eight years ago that eight of the entire Cabinet retired as a result of an election? It can happen again - it can happen again. In fact I suggest that's one of the reasons that my honourable friends are putting it in to start with. They can see it happening again. So, Mr. Chairman, I'm not very happy with this "brain child." That's what they called the late Sam Rayburn's idea. They referred to it as "Sam Rayburn's brain child." Well this is the Conservative Government's brain child to set them up in business and I'm not very happy with it.

So, Mr. Chairman, I think that in fairness to the people of the province and in fairness to this committee, and in consideration of the fact that no election has been announced yet, that we postpone and delay this bill, give it some more thought, give another couple some more thought,

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd). delay it till the next session of the Legislature. If the members opposite -- if the government really believes that there's going to be an election before we meet again next February and if they really feel that they are in for a defeat, then I can understand them wanting to proceed at this session of the Legislature. If they feel the opposite, then they should be the first ones -- they should be the first ones to say, "Well okay, we'll withdraw it; we'll have another look at it; we'll bring in one that is acceptable; we'll bring in one that doesn't need an amendment before the bill is laid on our desks.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Mr. Chairman, I haven't taken part in this debate for awhile now and when I did take part in it I declared myself and my position, that I accept the basic principle so far as pensions are concerned, that it should be done, and I think that with one or two exceptions, most of the members in this House who have spoken, including members of the Liberal Party, are not in disagreement with the basic principle of some pension. However, during the debate on this matter, it seemed that the finger of scorn was directed toward the front benches and others who will be able to compute for their purposes of the pension their full ministerial salaries, full salary of Madam Speaker and the Leader of the Opposition.

We have had a considerable number of figures suggested in this House as to probabilities and possibilities of how high the pensions eventually may be paid to Cabinet Ministers, and I suppose to some degree to members as well after a relatively short period of service. This matter has been one of those subjects that has caught the imagination of the general public. Editorially, both Winnipeg papers have raised questions of doubt, particularly in respect to the extent to which eventual payments may rise to -- eventual pensions.

Now I'm a very compromising sort of a fellow at all time as I'm sure all of the members of this House are fully aware, and I can see in the present legislation before us some cause for concern. I'm of the opinion that the members of Cabinet, the Speaker and the Leader of the Opposition, during the holding of their respective positions are in a position where they are a little bit different than the rest of us, due to the fact that they put full time into their respective positions. But I think, Mr. Chairman, that many of the points that have been raised in connection with this have some validity.

So as I say, Mr. Chairman, as the compromiser, I would like to suggest - and I haven't the formal amendment before me at the present time - would suggest that instead of using the full basis of the ministerial and other full-time personnel, instead of using the full salary as a basis for computation, I offer as a suggestion, in the very mellow and amiable spirit that I find myself in at the present time, that one-half of the salaries be used for computing the pension in respect of the people of whom I have just spoken.

I think this will still enure to the people concerned in Part II a reasonable pension, for it will then be based on at the present time, \$6,225 plus the \$3,200, roughly speaking around about 9-1/2 thousand dollars for the basis - if my mathematics are in accordance with my mellow mood this morning - it would be somewhere on the basis of about \$9,000 a year as a base for computing the contributions and also for the pension. As I say, Mr. Chairman, I haven't a formal motion before me but I would like to offer this as a suggestion which in my opinion will possibly be more acceptable to all concerned.

Again I say that as far as the basic principle of pensions is concerned, I agree most heartily with that principle. I do agree that all of the members on - at least at present on full-time employment or duty in this Assembly, should be given greater consideration than the members of the House who are not full-time. The alternative would be to possibly delete reference to the whole of Part II of the bill. I could not agree with that deletion because I think that the Ministers are entitled to consideration over and above the ordinary member.

So, Mr. Chairman, in a spirit of goodwill, in a spirit of attempting to make this more rational in some people's eyes at least, I offer this as a suggestion to the government. I appreciate the situation insofar as consideration of this proposal I make due to the present position of the House. It may be that the government will not have an opportunity of fully caucusing or considering the ramifications of my proposal. On the other hand, Mr. Chairman, I suggest that this could be acceptable insofar as the present legislation is concerned, and like all other legislation this could be subject to amendment at a subsequent session of the House if this is not found to be practical or indeed not found to be fair.

So I offer this, Mr. Chairman, as an endeavour not to try and resolve the differences of opinion that exist, but I think it might be considered as being practical and I offer it for the consideration of this committee.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, the speech made by the Leader of the New Democratic Party I think indicates clearly the problem that faces us in this bill, or one of the problems at least. The government introduced the bill the other day. Within a day of introduction the Minister who introduced it advised us that there would be major amendments to the bill - very major amendments, Mr. Chairman, changing completely from a financial standpoint, insofar as the people of Manitoba, the original proposition which was to have been a lifetime pension starting at any age provided that a member had eight sessions. A member could conceivably, if he's elected at the minimum age of 21, spend eight years here; retire at age 29 and have a pension for life; and if normal life expectancy is 67, then he'd be getting a pension from the people of Manitoba from age 29 to age 67, and longer if he lived beyond that.

The bill was barely before us, the ink was barely dry on the printing of that draft, when the Minister came in and said, "oh, oh," and as a result of the objections that we raised on this side of the House he was going to amend the bill, and suddenly it changed from a lifetime pension to a pension for 12 years. If you took it before age 55, it was going to be only a 12-year pension; and if you took it at age 55, well then it would go to the end of your life, and I think the basis -- he said this was on the idea that the average age was 67, so 55 and 67 is 12. A complete change in the whole attitude toward the bill as a result of opposition from my group here in the House, Mr. Chairman, and all of this in the matter of a few hours. Now we have the Leader of the NDP who is suggesting another change in the bill. If we're going to amend it, he suggests in another way to vary the provisions again.

Now what does this point out, Mr. Chairman? It points out very clearly that this bill simply has not had enough thought put into it by the government. There was certainly no indication earlier in the session that the government was planning any such pension. Nothing whatever was said about it in the Throne Speech, and I suggest that on a matter of this type it should be in the Throne Speech. When you look at some of the statements that were made in the Throne Speech, for example the indication that the government was going to proceed on matters of civil rights and protection of the individual, and we ended up with a resolution referring this as a study to a committee. If those sort of things go into a Throne Speech, then surely a proposal for a pension plan for members of this House, a plan that has substantial financial considerations attached to it insofar as the taxpayers of this province, then surely that should have been in the Throne Speech.

But it wasn't there and it came to this House in what was expected to be the dying days of the session. It came to this House after the speed-up motion was in process. Mr. Chairman, I don't need to tell members of this House what the speed-up motion means. When members sit here three separate sessions per day from 9:30 in the morning until about midnight, if they have to do any work at all in preparation of material, it's quite obvious that it's difficult to pay proper attention and to analyze, as needs to be analyzed, the legislation that the government presents, and yet that's when this bill was presented to us.

It was introduced in this House, according to my notes, on Wednesday - I believe it was Wednesday the 4th of May, Mr. Chairman. Here we are in the matter of a couple of days -- (Interjection) -- beg pardon? Four days? Well four days only because we objected, Mr. Chairman. If the members of my group had not opposed the bill, spoken against it, it would have gone through at that time. We had precious little time to prepare any material for it, and it's obvious that the government themselves either did not give it any thought or purposely proceeded with it on that basis and the expectation that it would not get proper analysis at this time.

I say to the government that that is not the proper way to proceed on matters of this sort, and to come now and suggest major changes and major amendments at this point is a clear indication that this bill is not ready. It's a clear indication that the government itself doesn't know what it wants to do with this bill. Well then what is the House to do, Mr. Chairman? I suggest that there's only one solution to this problem at the moment, and that is to refer this bill to one of the committees that will be sitting during the summer recess.

What have we done at this session, Mr. Chairman? We've established six committees that will be sitting during the summer period. This morning, at the opening of this session, we established the Committee on Statutory Orders and Regulations and gave it its instructions as to what it was to consider. Yesterday, or the day before, the Minister of Health re-established the Denturist Committee. A few days ago we established a Committee on the Rules of the House. We carried over from last session and reappointed a Committee on Highway Safety and gave it its instructions as to what it was to consider. Mr. Chairman -- well let me go on. We established a Committee on Municipal Affairs, this committee to consider such things

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd). as boundaries for municipalities and so on. It will sit between sessions. We've established a Committee on Consumer Credit. It will proceed to consider the report of the Premier's committee.

In almost all these cases, Mr. Chairman, these committees are either the re-establishment of committees that have already been studying a subject, or the establishment of committees to study things that have been before us for some time, for example the rules of the House. The members of this House are constantly debating the rules, nevertheless we feel it necessary to set up a committee so as to analyze them in a clear-headed and quiet way which is not always possible here in the House.

The Dental Committee has been sitting for a year - a full year - having hearings on this, travelling and seeing what's being done elsewhere, and we are re-establishing it because the Minister didn't feel that they had completed their work.

The Highway Safety Committee similarly has been sitting for a year. It had a number of sessions. It had, in addition to the work that it did, a special committee that was set up by the government separately which I understand gave information in this particular field.

Consumer credit - we've had investigations in this field. We had a special commission - the Tallin Commission - set up to study some of the abuses in the credit granting field. We've had a committee that has been considering ways and means of giving the people of this province more protection in their purchasing. We've had a number of debates in this House in the past on the subject of consumer credit.

So there we have the situation, Mr. Chairman, where on a number of issues, issues that have been debated here before; issues that have had committees studying them before; issues that the members of this House had had an opportunity to discuss, to make up their minds to what they wanted to do; and we've set up six committees to sit between sessions to study it further. We come along to a pension bill, and what do we do? It's presented to us and in a matter of four days the members of this House are expected to make a decision and vote on this.

I say to the government that you're making a grave mistake. You're making a very grave mistake if you proceed in this manner. There's only one thing to do with this bill, Mr. Chairman, and that is to refer it to one of the committees that is going to sit during the summer period. I suggest to the government that the proper place to send it would be the committee that we established this morning, the Statutory Orders and Regulations Committee, or the Rules of the House Committee. I think that both of these will be dealing with matters having to do in some cases with the management of this House and that there we can get a proper investigation of this bill. We can find out what it means in terms of the members of the House; we can find out what it means in terms of cost to the people of Manitoba; we can make an analysis of plans in other provinces; we can have expert advice from other people who have established a pension plan; and we can see whether or not this is a desirable thing to do, and if it is a desirable thing to do, what is the best way of doing it.

Surely the best way of doing it is not to bring in a bill on the 4th of May without proper consideration, and there is no better proof that it has not had consideration than the fact that the Minister who introduced it, within hours of having introduced it as the result of objections from us, made major amendments to the bill, and that we are having proposals now for further amendments. You can't make sound legislation on that basis, Mr. Chairman. The government will be making a very grave error if it persists in this course and we are going to object to it. My party, Mr. Chairman, are not prepared to accept this Pension Bill. We are going to vote against it and we are going to fight against it if the government persists in pushing it through the House as it has indicated it intends to do.

I say to the government: Reconsider your position. Reconsider what it is that you are doing here. This has not been considered adequately. You have admitted that by your actions. What harm will be done, Mr. Chairman, if this is referred to a committee for further study? What harm? Unless the government is considering having an election between now and the next session and some of the government members either do not intend to run again or expect to be defeated - and I can certainly assure them that on the second course, that if they have an election a large number of them will certainly be defeated - if this is what the government is planning, if it is planning an election, then of course the government can say there's urgency.

Mr. Chairman, I think that possibly on a number of issues there should be an election in Manitoba, but I don't think that the government will be proceeding with an election in the next year. I think the government will be anxious to have the people of Manitoba forget the massive tax bill that it imposed upon them. I think they'll be anxious to have some time pass, hoping

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd) that the people will forget before they call an election. In any case, Mr. Chairman, under our normal rules of procedure in the province, our next election would likely be in 1966. The last one was in December of 1962. Taking the normal four years, it would be 1966; taking the maximum term it could be 1967. It is unlikely to be 1965.

One of the reasons given by my honourable friends opposite for doing this, and in that very flowery speech made by the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, his main reason was to get better men into this House. Well, Mr. Chairman, if this is so, then the time that the better men will be coming into this House will be at the time of the next election, not before that. And if it is so that introducing a pension plan is in fact going to induce better men to come forward, then the time that the pension plan will be important is the time when the election is called. And I repeat, if we are not going to have an election in 1965, then what is the urgency of the bill if the avowed purpose is to bring better men into public life?

I can see no harm whatever, Mr. Chairman, being done to anyone by referring this bill to a committee; by giving it proper study; because it certainly needs it - it certainly needs it. The first draft that was presented to us by the Minister, the Provincial Secretary is, in my opinion a prime example of ghastly legislation - an unbelievable bill - a bill that surely could not have been considered by my honourable friends opposite. Maybe considered by the Cabinet, but I can't think, as I look over the rows of the backbenchers across from me, that those people had a proper opportunity to examine this bill and that they knew what this bill was going to do.

I don't think that those backbenchers sitting across there who had to stand up in this House and defend the heat tax that was imposed by this government at a summer session of 1964 and was debated at this session, I don't think that those members across there realized that this could mean pensions up to 6 and 7 and 8 thousand dollars per year for someone who sat here for 15 years. I don't believe that they realized what this bill meant, and I say to them, do not persist in this course. Do not push this matter through the House. Send this bill to a committee where it can be studied properly. Let us not have this sort of rush legislation that has not been properly considered, that may not accomplish even the purpose that the government claims for it, and certainly is not set up on any kind of a sound basis.

It will not hurt anyone, Mr. Speaker, if this bill is sent to a committee for further study, unless, I repeat, that the government intends to have an election. If that's the government's intention, then let it so announce. Let it say so. Let's not bring in this bill in this manner and ram it down the throats of the members at a time when they do not have the opportunity for proper study.

I suggest to the backbenchers on the far side that they should let their views be known to their Cabinet colleagues; that they stand up and tell their Cabinet colleagues what they think about this and how they are going to defend what the government has done in this case, the rushing through of a bill that is not properly set up, not properly considered, at the very end of the session, to help who, Mr. Chairman? To help ourselves, the members of this House.

I am not prepared to accept this bill, Mr. Chairman, and I will continue fighting it as long as it needs to be fought. I say to the government, reconsider -- reconsider. It's not too late. The committees are established. There is an opportunity to give this matter proper study to see to it that it needs to be done to begin with; and if it needs to be done, how it should be done. Only in this way will we be sure that we are doing the right thing for the people of this province.

. continued on next page

HON. MAITLAND B. STEINKOPF, Q. C. (Provincial Secretary) (River Heights): Mr. Chairman, we have just listened to quite an oration. We've been told that we're making a very grave mistake, all of which sounded most onerous at the start, but as the admonition became more repetitive, why it sounded to me just like a broken record, and as the talk kept going on, I was reminded of the fact that no souls were saved you know after ten minutes and if mine is past redemption, certainly nothing that was said by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has tended to change my feelings, because in the length and breadth of his speech he never once referred to any of the ominous or grave dangers that were part of the proposed bill.

Much has been made about the fact that the bill was amended over the objection or the objections of the honourable members of the Opposition, but once in awhile one feels that they should deserve a little bit of credit for a good suggestion, and it was in fact part of a suggestion that was made in one of the speeches that gave us the idea that it might be a wise thing to bring in a bill that would be agreeable and would serve the purpose of all the members of this House.

I propose now, Mr. Chairman, to refer to a number of figures, and for that reason I would like your indulgence to follow my notes rather closely. The Opposition in the kicking up of the dust that they have over this bill have successfully I think obscured in the fog the principle that lies behind it. There are many reasons for bringing in this bill, one of which and only one of which is the fact that it may or may not attract a different type -- I'm not going to say even a better type of individual to offer himself to the services of the House. But this is not one of the suggestions that I have made nor is it a cardinal one on which I base the reason or reasons for being very pleased and actually happy to bring in the bill.

There was an interesting editorial in last night's Winnipeg Tribune, and I presume it's carried in the paper this morning. I think they got their lead from the large cards, the big cards, the very big cards that -- (Interjection) -- yes, the big cards that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface now shows up to me which are hard to see due to the fog, that had the story of some very attractive figures. Well the same thing happens when an over-zealous editor tries to be a pension critic as when a politician enters the pension field. They suggest in their opening paragraph -- or the man who wrote this does -- that the bill was introduced into the Legislature this week with all the financial intoxication characteristic of political excursions into the pension field. It was quite obvious that they were referring and comparing this bill with the actions that had taken place in another Assembly.

I suggest that when you read farther in the article and you start to analyze some of the figures that are presented here, it places the man who wrote that in almost the same intoxicating position that he suggests we politicians are in. He suggests, and I quote, "An MLA leaving the House at age 55 after 15 years of service would receive an annual lifetime pension of \$1,440.00. His total premiums to get that pension would be \$2,820.00. A private person to build a similar annuity payable at 55 for life would need to invest \$18,828."

Now that figure of \$18,828 stuck in my mind. It just didn't seem right that that figure should be so high in comparison to the figures that I have been working with over the past few months. Then I realized and I remembered that I had a pension plan and I looked it up and here it is. Canadian Government Annuity No. 111728. The term of this annuity is a lifetime annuity or guaranteed for 20 years. The amount of the annuity is \$1,200 per year or \$100.00 a month. -- (Interjection) -- Beg pardon? The payments -- I'll give you all those figures -- the payments are due in 1968, at which time I will be 55 years old. The date of the issue of this policy is the 15th day of July, 1946, and my age at that time was 34 years old.

Now this policy seemed to me to be based on facts as close as those cited in the Tribune as one could possibly get. The elapsed time in the Tribune example was 20 years before payment. The elapsed time in my policy is 22 years. The benefits the Tribune example cited was \$1,440 per year, and in this policy No. 11728 the annuity is \$1,200 per year, some \$240.00 less but close enough to make a fairly good comparison. The age limit for taking the pension in the Tribune was 55, and in my case the age limit is 55.

Then I looked at this and I said there must be something wrong, and then I realized when I looked at it that there is one big big difference, one very very big difference, and this is one of the reasons why it is so difficult to predict an actuarial figure for a group so small as this that would make any real sense. The cost of this policy to me is not \$18,828; it wasn't even \$8,000.00. Here it is stated, \$7,915.20 paid on the 15th day of July, 1946. Now it's very easy

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Would you mind repeating just the last figure that you

MR. STEINKOPF: \$7,915.20. There is no premium, it was just a cash payment, exactly the same as this cash payment suggested here of \$18,828 for almost the same benefits. When one considers that in 1946 the rates of interest on money were substantially below what they are now, and the Canadian Government annuities have been traditionally low in compounding the benefits that they get - I think that they have always found it very hard to compete with commercial organizations - one would feel that for a pension today under the same benefits that the down payment would even be less, because even at the best this couldn't be compounded at any more than four percent, that the rate today would be closer to five and maybe even a little bit better than five percent, so that the figure of what could happen in this case I think is pretty obvious.

Now why would a sober intelligent gentleman such as the editor or the gentleman who wrote this editorial make such a classical mistake. I think I can understand what he did. I think he worked this thing out - it's very simple, our plan is very straightforward - it says that you pay six percent of your indemnity for all the years that you are in the House and you get a return of three percent payable at the age of 55, or if you choose for some certain period of 12 years prior to 55. He was able to calculate that but he wanted to find out what it would cost - how does this compare with a commercial plan that one of the well-known life insurance companies would have, so he picked up the telephone and he called some friend of his and he said, "I'd like to have \$1,440 per year for life starting at 55 and I'm now 50. How much money do I have to give you for that?" And probably the information he received was this sum of \$18,828.

Now that in itself wouldn't be too bad if you were to understand that under our plan there is absolutely no guarantee of receiving any money back whatsoever should you die before you receive the pension or after you get it, except for the money that you paid into the account. Your estate would receive that back without any interest. The government would have had the use of the interest.

Now this fine little difference makes a very very big difference actuarially. This plan of the government's here, at the very top it says "Guaranteed for 20 years," so that no matter what happens, if you take \$1,200 times 20 years you get back a minimum of \$24,000. You put up \$7,915; you must make a profit of \$16,000 or over 200 percent increase on your investment, and this not even compounded but worked out on a minimum basis of four percent per year.

So in playing with figures or playing with big cards, it is a very very simple thing to come up with figures that make sense, and of course I can't berate or get mad at anyone for taking figures and using them to their best political advantage and coming up with astronomical figures because that is part of the way of life that we get used to after some 50 days sitting in this House, but sooner or later one must come down to the real facts of the case.

I have tried to explain to the Honourable Member for Gladstone - and he asked me again this morning - why or how we arrived at the approximate cost of \$20,000, and we did after quite a bit of work come up with an estimated cost of an average cost of \$20,000. Now I plan to take you through the next two elections, and in my rather naive and unsophisticated political way, try to predict what could happen in an election say in 1967 and the next election in 1972 - assuming that they're five years apart - because this plan does not change materially at any time except at election time unless some member would resign, and if a member resigned, why this wouldn't affect the financial implications to any great extent.

Let's go back one election, back to 1962. This is still fresh in our minds, and it is I believe a rather - it's a fact that we have. The next two elections are all hypothetical. If you take the average of 15 years or 16 years that are involved, you come up with what I think would be a fairly reasonable average. Now I don't intend to stake my political future or any future on these figures because there are so many unknowns, so many intangibles and so many things that could materially affect it because of the very small group of men in this House - and women - and even if all 57 of them were to be turned out say at the next election, we could come up with a figure that would only be good for the ensuing year or two because of the death factor, that there are no payments at all the moment that there is death.

If this plan had been in effect immediately preceding the election in 1962, the average cost to the public of Manitoba for the last four years - that's 1962, '63, '64 and '65, including this year - would be \$344.50 per year. Now this is taking those men who did not choose to run again and those men who were defeated. This includes Cabinet Ministers and all who had qualified under the eight-year period, the prerequisite that is required before payment.

Then let us assume that there is no election until '67 and that there were no further

(MR. STEINKOPF cont'd.) resignations and that no one in the plan had died. The average cost for the six years of 1962 to 1967 all inclusive, would have risen from \$344.50 per year to \$667.35. This comes about because in the first two years you take back the contribution that the person has contributed to the fund so that actually there is no cost in the first two years of any man going on pension.

Now in the election that - I can't tell when it's going to come - but let's say it's in 1967 and let's say that we have a very bad election, that is for Cabinet Ministers, and three of them are defeated. At the moment not more than half of the Cabinet Ministers at that time would be eligible for a pension, so three of the Cabinet Ministers that are eligible for a pension, let's say that they are defeated, together with 12 members of the House, or a total of 15 are either defeated or they have decided not to run again. The pension cost to the plan for the five years of 1968, 1969, 1970, 1971 and 1972 would cost an additional \$26,400 for each of those years; and for the period, taking the average from 1962 to 1972, both years included, and assuming again that there were no deaths - and again I must remind you that if there is a death there is absolutely no benefit to a widow or an estate of any kind provided for in this plan, not even a return of interest on the funds that the government will have the use of - and assuming that no other member has become eligible through resignation, then the average cost for the eleven years would be \$12,959.

Now I'm going to carry this through just one more election on the same basis to give you some idea of how we arrived at this \$20,000, and no matter how long you study it or how many committees you're going to refer it to, they're going to come up with the same kind of big question mark, that run this plan for five or ten years and then we'll be able to give you a better actuarial figure as to what will happen, and even then no insurance firm will give you a guarantee of any kind that it will work that way.

Now let us assume that in the election of 1972 the same thing happens, another three Ministers with at this time 15 years service are defeated and another 12 members - and this is 15 eligible years as Cabinet Ministers are defeated - and another 12 members with 15 years of service also lose their seats, or what has happened in the next seven years, 30 members and six Cabinet Ministers have been replaced. The cost then for these additional men would be an additional \$28,980 per year, and now for the lengthened period of 1962 to 1977, the total cost over the 16 years to the Consolidated Fund, to the taxpayers of Manitoba, would be \$382,807, for an average over the 16 years of a cost of \$23,925.

At the peak, in 1977 the cost to the treasury would be \$65,423, and this again based on a heavy turnover of members all of them having qualified for the minimum years, that is 15 years if they are caught in the 1977 and 1972 election, and assuming again that we now have some men in here at 1977 that are well in their 80's -- I'm not taking that very fair figure that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition gave, and that is the life expectancy is 67, because worked out on that basis at 67 I wouldn't even be around in time to collect any funds from this. But taking all the worst factors, we come out to an amount of \$65,423 in its worst year, but an average over a fairly long period of time of \$23,925.

Now it's almost unfair to take any one period like this and expect and hope for - I do not think and I don't think there's any member in this House who would disagree that it would be good to have a turnover of more than 60 percent of the members of this House in two elections and the same percentage of the Cabinet Ministers, and this is not within the realm of politics as to what side the Cabinet Ministers are on. I am trying to arrive at a fair figure as to how I suggested to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that the figure was in the neighbourhood of \$20,000 a year.

But if that did happen over the period of time -- let's extend it a little bit longer. What would happen say if it were possible to project this thing for a hundred years, and if you did, would it be unreasonable to take the same figure that the Speaker of the House down in the States, Mr. Rayburn, took of \$2 million to build his nice building - which I thought was pretty far removed from the matter of pensions for the 57 members of the Manitoba Legislature - but it sounded like a pretty good figure of \$2 million. But if you were to work it out which I did, and I'm not going to belabour the point in this House because it's loaded with additional figures, that a \$2 million figure would more, by far, because you couldn't possibly -- if you kept on changing the House 60 percent in every two sessions, there wouldn't be anyone eligible for the pension plan under this eight-year minimum term -- eight-session term. One must consider that many of these sessions may go to the full five, and if they do the average will be closer to nine years for two sessions than the eight. But a \$20,000 a year figure based on a hundred years is most

(MR. STEINKOPF cont'd.) . . . realistic and maybe some day someone is reading the Hansard of the year 2065, they may be able to go back and figure out how much or how close we were to the \$2 million mark.

I'm satisfied that the plan has been given any amount of study. It is a composite plan based on features in some of the plans of the other eight provinces that are now in use, and certainly we took a look at the plan in Ottawa. And having done that, what more can we do? What do you compare this with? You can't compare it with an ordinary annuity or pension because if you do you fall into the very trap that the editor of the Tribune did. He's got himself a figure of \$18,828, when if the facts were as we have them in our particular kind of a bill, or plan, it would only be a fraction of that amount. It is misleading; I don't think it was intended that way. I'm sure that the figure that is quoted in the Tribune is arrived at, but certainly not on the same basis as we have arrived at, and our payments are made at the time that the member becomes a part of the plan. He must elect - as a matter of fact he must elect within a year from the time that this bill is passed whether or not he wishes to become a party of it. This is strictly voluntary.

I think that the Honourable Member for Brokenhead was the only one who stuck to the real crux of the matter and understood exactly what we were trying to get at, and his position being a little odd, I think that he should be commended for the attitude he took. My own position in this pension plan - I too would like to state that I have no interest in it because it doesn't affect me and I didn't bring it in for any interest that I might have had.

I hope to be around here for a long time. I have listened to the predictions of the honourable members of the Liberal Party, not only about the future of this government at the next election but they were very confident in their prediction in the election of last fall that the voters of River Heights would see the wisdom in voting in the Liberal candidate. All I can say is if their predictions about the next election are as good as what they were last fall, I'm not going to be alarmed about the panic button that they have been ringing, about the grave and onerous responsibility, the bad things we're doing about bringing in this bill without saying anything about it, because I think that the public of Manitoba will realize the value they have received for the conscientious, honest and unfettered manner in which the affairs of this province have been directed in the past by their legislators and will be in the future.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, might I ask a question of the Honourable the Minister who has just taken his seat? I'd just like to ask my honourable friend that is it not a fact that if he would apply to the 1946 cash payment that he made the value of the 1965 dollar, that the figure might come pretty close to the one used by the editor of the Tribune? Or taking it the other way around, is my honourable friend expecting in a year or so now to get paid off in dollars that were as good as the ones he put in in 1946?

MR. STEINKOPF: Mr. Chairman, I think it just works the reverse. I think that this is based, and I tried to make that clear, on money that certainly wasn't worth more than four percent at that time, and that the average income on money now would be five percent. You'd have to put up less in order to get \$100.00 a month 22 years from now. If it had not been Saturday I would have tried to have found out what the Canadian Government would require for the same kind of a pension plan, for an annuity at 55 twenty-two years hence. The odd thing is that my age at this time was 34 - just about the same age as we've been talking about, that somebody coming in here at 21 - I'd have had 13 years at that time, almost exactly the same kind of a deal there. I too agree that the \$100.00 a month certainly won't buy as much in 1968 as it did in 1946, but isn't that going to be true about the pensions that the honourable members of this House get in 1988 or in 1998 when they get them?

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, if I could ask the honourable gentleman another question. Isn't it a fact that most of the people that we are thinking about here are people who are not concerned as much in the interest they get on their money as in the cost of living, and doesn't the cost of living, doesn't that have a great effect on the value of their dollars in 1965?

MR. STEINKOPF: Yes, I agree with that.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, two questions. Why - I asked these two before - why, if it is such an important bill, was it delayed until the dying days of the session? That was the one question that I asked. And (2), what would be the consequences if it was delayed until the next session? That's the two questions that remain unanswered as yet. Why the rush?

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister that just spoke talked about the big bad Liberals again coming out and repeating the same thing. He compared this to a broken record and I've noticed that he's been working at this for quite a while. I saw him

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) . . . yesterday. He was working quite hard this morning again, so if nothing else, we've certainly forced him to do his homework, something that he hadn't done before. Before, I think -- I haven't got the paper here where the Free Press quoted him as saying when he was asked, "Where do you get this figure of \$20,000?" "Well, a friend of mine in the insurance business told me that that could be it, that his guess was as good as mine and it didn't matter anyways as it was practically impossible to find."

Well I know that whenever anybody wants to sell you a plan, either for a group of employees or for yourself, they come in -- any insurance agents that I've ever seen -- they come in with all kinds of figures and I've never heard one say "Well, take any guess, it doesn't matter because it's impossible to find out," even when they're talking about a different group of employees.

Now we're talking about -- first of all, that we were using political figures. I'd like to also ask the Honourable Minister a few questions. What does he mean by "political figures"? Political, I think, must derive from the word politics, and politics we're told at this time is the management of the affairs of the public; or I guess that sometimes you mean politics, that you're not worried about the public and you're just trying to be elected. So the same word could mean two different opposites.

I'd like to know what is meant by that "political advantage". How else can we do anything in a democratic form of government, especially when the government has a substantial majority, but to try to point out the mistakes as we see them. Call it politics if you want. If bringing to the attention of the people of Manitoba what we feel is wrong, if that's politics, well we on this side are playing politics, and it's up to the people of Manitoba to decide. I think that this is the basis of a democratic form of government. This is why you want a strong opposition and this is why you have a government. You have to have somebody ready, willing and able to take over when the government proves that it can no longer manage the affairs of the people of the province adequately.

Now first of all I think that in this question we should discuss the principle of the whole thing. Now if we could take this thing apart and discuss the question of the principle of the pension -- and I think we should do this first. You don't come in with a plan. If you're running a business you find out -- and my honourable friend certainly knows that -- do I want a plan? First of all, is it a good thing? Are my employees qualified for this? Is it feasible? Is it practical? Can we pay for it? I think that this is the first thing.

And under this first question I would say that at this time the principle shouldn't even be discussed, unless we disapprove the principle, and then when we can afford it, when the time comes, if this is the will of the Assembly, the group, well then we go ahead and put it into force. But to shove it into force the last day of the session, this is not discussing the question of the principle. This is the government -- this is the government whose leader has been lecturing the people in Ottawa about priorities. At the last convention the government, or the party anyway, admitted that it was running this province in the red because it had a big sign, "Next time let's get all Manitoba out of the red."

Well does that mean then that this is going to get Manitoba -- this is what it says here -- There's a big heading, there's a picture of Mr. Roblin and Mr. Diefenbaker, and on top of that it's got, "Next time let's get all Manitoba out of the Red." Now we have quoted at the same session there was a motion -- (Interjection) -- oh, just this last session -- it would be worse now. And there's been a -- I don't know if it's a telegram or a letter -- publicly anyway, the First Minister and the rest of them -- and I think he was wise, I think he was right -- advised the Prime Minister to be careful with priorities. So I ask this question. I'm not going to play politics. You people answer it. Is this the top of the hit parade in your priority list? This is one question that I would like to have answered.

Now I'm asking you if this is the right time to bring it? The honourable member that just spoke, the Minister that just spoke said if this wasn't Saturday I'd get this information, but they're going to rush it through today if they can. If it wasn't Saturday I'd get the information. Can my honourable friend tell me -- can my honourable friend tell me that if he was running his business he'd say, "Let's rush it through. The place is closed. I can't get an answer till Monday. Today is Saturday. Let's rush it through."

The Budget Speech the last few years has been so complete you can't bring in anything. Because you've got one word that mentions something about this, you're beating the gun -- (Interjection) -- What did I say? Oh, the budget. No, that's yet to come. I mean the Throne Speech. Anything is -- you're jumping the gun -- you're anticipating. Well there certainly

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) ... wasn't any anticipation in this. Why is it an important piece of legislation like this can come in at the very last week?

The Lieutenant-Governor of this province has been running around in the hall the last few days just waiting to be called in. He was here yesterday and he was here today, waiting. And bang, we're going to have the session end at this time, but because it's Saturday we can't get the explanation. So can anybody tell me - am I playing politics when I ask this question, when I ask you, "Is that the way you'd run your business?"

MR. STEINKOPF: Yes.

MR. DESJARDINS: That's the way you'd run your business? You would say, "Today's Saturday, I won't get the information now but I'll put it in."

MR. STEINKOPF: I'd go to church first and then I'd do it.

MR. DESJARDINS: I beg your pardon?

MR. STEINKOPF: I'd go to church first and then do it.

MR. DESJARDINS: You'd go to church first. Well I fail to understand what you mean. Maybe you'd get the information at church. You go to church first and then you do it. You'd do what? There's a lot of things you can do when you come out of church. What is it that you do? Maybe we should go to church first and then come back and do this. I'll go for that. Maybe we should adjourn; we'll go to church; and then we'll see. My honourable friend brought this question of church - I don't know what he means by that.

MR. FRED GROVES (St. Vital): I'll go with you.

MR. DESJARDINS: In the same church? Well this is worth something. The Honourable Member from St. Vital is coming to my church. I think we should all adjourn then. -- (Interjection) -- No, no, you've got those things arranged.

Now I want to know if this is a fair pension - I mean fair works both ways - if it's too much, it's not fair; if the maximum is right. My honourable friend told us about his pension, his plan that he has and he says, "Well money is not the same." He says we're using political figures. Did he tell me that this will be raised, the cards that I've used? Did he tell me that when the maximum on the cost of living comes up, and then we come here and vote ourselves an increase - I don't even qualify on this and I've had two increases already - the maximum will go up? Are we preparing the way for this? We were told we're the lowest paid MLAs in Manitoba - well in Manitoba yes, but in Canada. We get 30 - what is it, \$3,600? What about the maximum? -- (Interjection) -- Yes, we did \$200.00 a day at that short session.

So I want to know if he's figured this out when he's talking about the editor of the Tribune and so on. Does he say, "Well the maximum is only" - just a minute, I have it here in those cards that he doesn't like - the maximum now would be for this case that I took, a very realistic case, a Cabinet Minister elected at 30 years old, but under these figures that we have now the maximum would be 10,990. Well the maximum could go -- the maximum can go higher pretty fast.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Is that a flash card?

MR. DESJARDINS: Well I don't know. What do you mean by flash? Is it a flash card or what is it you want? I'll make you a set and then you can call it what you want, okay? -- (Interjection) -- Well what is it that you want? You can come and sit here and copy it if you want, then you won't call it a flash card. Whatever you want, I'll try to accommodate you. If you don't get too touchy though. I have corrected this card too because of this great amendment - but we'll come to that after.

Now I've got some more questions to ask. I want to know -- Mr. Chairman, I'd like to know if he feels - he said he'd do this in his business - if he feels this year - or last year when we had a special session where we were paid \$200.00 a day to put in a tax on the people of Manitoba, that we were underpaid? We received \$200.00 a day and we shove a tax on the people of Manitoba to get Manitoba out of the red and to try and arrange our - what did he call that? A priority list. Now -- (Interjection) -- Yes, that was "the changing face of Manitoba" as they called it.

Well, is it the time when we've got the tax - the ordinary person that we're so worried about finds a hard time to go in his car, take his family for a ride. Everytime he goes out for a mile or so he is paying quite a bit to the government here. I think it's 17 cents tax on every single gallon of gas. If he wants to enjoy himself a bit; if he wants a social drink; if he buys a bottle that costs the manufacturer 90 cents, he pays about \$6.00 or \$6.50. Then he has to pay - he has a tax on heat. Can you tell me that we've got the right to even think about this when we have to impose a tax on heat? This is a question I'd like to have answered. It's true, isn't it?

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) . . Am I playing politics now? Have we got a tax on heat, first of all. And weren't we told this was bad, but we had to do this or we're going to have the sales tax. Were we told this or weren't we told it, and if so, is this the time to talk about pensions? That's another question that I would like answered.

Now this is a question that I'd really like to see the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources - and I feel that he should be here to defend it because I understand that he is really pushing this thing - I would like to ask him what -- well we can ask anybody here -- what has the affairs of Ottawa have to do with us.

Am I wrong when I say that I was elected in Manitoba by Manitobans to try to look after the affairs of Manitoba? There's nothing that says - not in any of my campaign - whatever the Liberals do in Ottawa, I will do. I don't remember signing any documents to that effect, and when the Clerk here had us sworn in, I don't remember it said, "Well you're a Liberal, whatever they do in Ottawa, you have to do." To say that everytime they do something in Ottawa I should stand up and yell -- they figure I yell too much in this House anyway. What has that got to do with Ottawa? That's a question that I'd like to have answered because I have heard an awful lot of this this session.

MR. SCHREYER: What about Sam Rayburn?

MR. DESJARDINS: Who is he? --(Interjection)-- Why tell me? That's another thing, do I have to endorse everything - I don't even get the Neepawa News to start with, so how can I endorse anything that my colleague says? I don't know what he -- I heard Sam Rayburn mentioned out there too. So I don't know what I have to do. Maybe it should --(Interjection)-- do you want me to read it? Is this from Neepawa? "Fuel Tax Heats Up Critics. 'There was no special reason', he replied" - that's Mr. McLean I guess - " 'The government need a certain amount of additional revenue and it had been a matter of judgment'." Well this was the Winnipeg Free Press, so I can quote this. "Fuel Tax Heats Up Critics. 'There was no special reason', he replied. 'The government needed a certain amount of additional revenue and it had been a matter of judgment which items would be taxed and how much'." That's the priority list of this government. --(Interjection)-- Who said this? Mr. McLean --(Interjection)-- Well they don't say that, I don't know.

MR. McLEAN: Give the name of my constituency please.

MR. DESJARDINS: What is it? You usually yell it yourself - I can't find it. Is it Dauphin? Yes, the people of Dauphin should be told that their representative believes in priorities but forgets about it when it's time to vote himself a nice fat pension. I think the people of Dauphin should know that too.

Now we were told by the Minister that spoke today that we are obscuring the principle. I'd like to have that clarified. What is obscuring the principle in this thing? Because I have these flash cards, I'm obscuring the principle. The principle as far as I'm concerned, have we got the right to even consider pensions at this time when the people are paying heat tax? That reminds me of Nero fiddling when Rome burned, as far as I'm concerned.

Now there's something very important. We've got to make it worthwhile for the good people to go into political fields. We've got to get a better type of people in this field. This is the Number One reason. You've got to make it worthwhile, everybody has to have a chance. So what do we do? We copy the plan of Ottawa, the famous Pearson plan - that was mentioned the same as I mention your constituency - the same reason I guess. Well anyway, this was mentioned. I ask this question to the members across from me: Have we got a better type in Ottawa? I read a lot of things during the flag debate; I read a lot of things about the papers and I've never seen one heading, "Better Class Serving at Ottawa since Pension has gone Up" - never read it. I've read the opposite. I have read about this - they're making a mockery, I've read - I don't say that I subscribe to everything that is said, but this is what the people think, some people anyway. I would like to ask my honourable friend, if we have a better type, if this Pearson - I'll mention this - if Pearson plan has attracted a better type of people in Ottawa? Now I think that we should also find out exactly, or as close as possible, what this cost - have we done this so far? Now the Honourable Minister also told us about his plan, his pension plan, he figured it was a good pension plan, he was satisfied with it. Now we're told also about the different sacrifices that we make to come here. That's true. But is it impossible for us to get our own plan, like the Minister did? Is it impossible if we want, haven't we got any responsibility about our future ourselves? Haven't we got any responsibility at all? Can you tell me that a Cabinet Minister who is getting \$17,500 can't put a few dollars aside to buy a plan, because he's made too many sacrifices and he will find it hard and difficult to go back to public life - to

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd). private life? This question hasn't been answered. This question hasn't been answered at all. We are getting some money - originally I think that the people used to serve for nothing. It was just this great love of trying to do something for their fellow man. And now it's got a price tag on everything we do. Now, I would like to know if this is not possible - to buy our own plan? To buy our own plan. I don't think that because you serve - oh, there was a great to-do make about the former people from this - former MLAs and even former Liberal Cabinet Minister who had to go and look for a job with his cap in his hand - and this was wrong because the people of Manitoba owed him a living. I don't believe in that. I don't believe in that. I think that you have to - you've got a job - there's no special favourite sons here, or daughters, in this province of ours. We serve and if we go back to our own life after that, it's up to us to make a living. You don't serve eight years here and then the world owes you a living. This is ridiculous. What about the people that stopped their lives to go and fight the war for us? They don't get a pension after eight years all of a sudden, for no reason at all when they're qualified to work. What's the matter with that? I think that they made much more sacrifice than we have coming here. I think that we should buy a plan.

I think he mentioned something, that there's one-third, or something, of the Ministers that would not qualify for this pension. I think he's the only one that won't, after the next session of '66. I might be wrong, but I don't know of another Minister that will not qualify after the next session of '66. Because all the other members came in -- '66. Won't that be eight sessions? All right. I came here in '59, and all the ministers except my honourable friend were here then - '59, '60, '61, '62, '63, '64, '65, '66 - that's eight years. Eight sessions. --(Interjection)-- As members. As anything. You qualify --(Interjection)-- I see did he mean as a cabinet minister? All right. I'm wrong on this. I understand what he means now.

Now another thing - and that was presented as a good point. This was presented as a good point - this thing that there's nothing, there's no benefit for the widows and the children. I think that's a weak point if anything. Mind you if you approve of the principle, I think that's a weak point because they're suffering while we're here. Well I should qualify that maybe they're not suffering that much Financially if we're suffering that much if we're not earning that much money I think that they're suffering, and I think if they're suffering there should be something for the widow. Any decent plan I thought would be -- I thought that a man that has his health which is the greatest thing and a bit of ambition could earn a living in this rich country of ours and I thought that when you have these different plans and insurance it was mostly to protect your children and your widow. I certainly don't think that this is a selling point, that it has no benefit for those that are left. I don't like it anyway.

Now, we're talking about amendments. My leader said that as soon as we brought this up there was an amendment. I don't know, I think he said - well maybe that was caused by something about the flash cards or something - I don't know, he mentioned that a couple of times. Well I think that anybody that prepares a plan like this, this is a first time in Manitoba, my honourable friend says well we shouldn't discuss this out of the House because it's never been done before. I don't know. I didn't know they had a pension here before. I thought this was the first time we were discussing pension and I think it should be out of the House and discuss this. Look at all the people that came in yesterday that we had in Committee. Can you tell me that any of those weren't sincere, can anybody tell me here that we didn't learn anything from these people? What would be so wrong, if we have nothing to lose, if everything is above board, if we've got anything to lose, but to let these people - and even though it's Saturday today, yesterday was Friday, we might have had somebody come from an insurance company and say you can buy a plan for this. What would be wrong with that? We're serving the public, somebody might have said, all right you deserve a pension, you should have a pension and they might have brought in some ideas. We only spoke here for an hour or so before today and already we had an amendment so we did help - we did something. Although, I don't think that this amendment, I don't think that it's as wonderful as one would lead us to believe, because we forgot that it's not - when you're staying until you're 55, especially if you're staying in as a cabinet minister or as a member, your pension is going up. I didn't have everybody ask me did you change your card. Well I didn't have to change my card very much - my flash card --(Interjection)-- All right -- those that didn't understand it too well, the first one that I showed, the Minister's salary is still \$12,500; the indemnity is still \$3,200 as of this session - maybe next year it'll be more. The total is still \$15,700 and we're still paying \$942 - those are my political figures, but this is what I read in the bill. That's it. Now my second card, the total is still \$17,500; we still get that three percent of this which is still \$471; the maximum

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd)..... is still 70 percent of salary or \$10,990; the maximum - maximum pension, yes, 70 percent. Now don't forget.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: One of the rules in this House that there shouldn't be repetition. You've been repeating quite a few things.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, what have I repeated, can you tell me? I think that it's impossible -- I'm showing that even with this amendment these are the same and I certainly have the right to do that. There's been an amendment let's remember that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You're repeating the same figures, the same cards.....

MR. DESJARDINS: Well we're still talking about the same bill aren't we? I certainly have the right to discuss this. They made allusion to them, when they said that this was wrong. I certainly have the right and since my honourable friend didn't see them - I'd like to know the rule that you can quote that I haven't the right to speak in committee as I did today.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The rule is that there shall be no repetition. If you have something new that is fine. If you haven't anything new.....

MR. CAMPBELL: It's not quite that definite, Mr. Chairman, I think if you'd read the rule.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Rule 38, Mr. Speaker or the Chairman of any committee after having called the attention of the House or of the committee to the conduct of a member who persists in irrelevance or repetition may direct him to discontinue his speech and if the member still continues to speak, and so on.....

MR. DESJARDINS: feel that this is repetitious of what I said today and not what any of the other members... (Interjection)-- All right, well I'll take just the cards that I've changed. I'll just take the cards that I changed and I'll keep on explaining the way I -- I'll pass these two old ones that I have. All right. Now the basic for this is \$471.00. This is the basic that we have here - this is the basic as I say going on this three percent. Now if we have eight years, we have to retire - we can only collect this pension when we're 55 or we collect it for 12 years only. Well I'll go to the maximum then, a member - we'll forget about this eight years, we'll go, a member that's 30 can only get it when he's 55. Well he can qualify for the maximum under the same which now - in 24 sessions; not years, sessions; but he will only be 55. Let's say that he retires at 55, and he's paid in only for 24 sessions - maybe he hasn't paid the last few years - well then he's getting \$915.83 a month - providing there is not an increase in wages or indemnities since then. \$915.83 a month, for a maximum per year of \$10,990 - and it only takes two years for him to recapture this. And especially for us now, this question that I call tailor made, especially for this - I say that it is tailor made because let's say that any cabinet minister or any members here, when this is passed, if it passes, we've got two years to decide if we want it or not - two years --(Interjection)-- One year, I thought it was -- oh two years to pay though isn't there? One year to decide and two years to pay isn't that it? - A cabinet minister has two years to pay? And at no interest - remember that it's no interest, Mr. Chairman. Therefore we can wait, the 1966 session will come and go, it's another year. Now we might get an election at the end of '66 after the session; this man has said yes, I want to qualify, I want to take advantage of this -- he hasn't paid a cent yet he's got two years to pay. He's got his time, his '66 session is in, he qualifies. Now he's out, he's entitled for the first year in 1967, he hasn't paid anything yet, he's entitled, \$314 a month. He hasn't paid a cent, not one cent. He's got this full year, all the rest of the year to pay, and he's picked up \$314 and he hasn't paid a cent yet. Are those political figures, I ask you; are those political figures or am I misunderstanding this bill? It says that you don't have to pay any interest at all. Therefore you could have your next session next year, '66 - an election at the end of '66. You mention that you want to take the advantage of this, but you haven't paid a cent yet because you've got more time to pay - you start receiving and you haven't put a cent in yet.

MR. STEINKOPF: How do you do this?

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, correct me if I'm wrong -- I'd like to. Isn't it fact that it says here.....

HON. ROBERT SMELLIE (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Birtle - Russell): Either you're in or you're not. If you qualify for it you've got to put up the money first.

MR. DESJARDINS: All right just a minute. Contribution in respect of prior indemnity: "Where a member elects under Section 5 to contribute in respect of indemnities paid to him before the coming into force of this Act, he shall pay to the Treasurer an amount equal to six percentum of all indemnities paid to him during the period in respect of which he elected to become a contributor in respect of indemnity." And then it's got --(Interjection)-- is that in the

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd). amendment, Sir? --(Interjection)-- Oh that's the one coming in this afternoon. And earlier it says that the contribution payable under subsection 3, that I read, of Section 6, respecting indemnities or salaries paid to a person before the coming into force of this Act may be paid without interest - that's what I said (a) at the time the person electing to make contribution makes the election. election to contribute - just a minute - over a period of not more than 24 months after the date on which the election is made. Now what did I say? This comes into force now; he doesn't have to say right away if he wants it or not so. Well let's say he does, let's say that -- all right, have you got the 1966 session? Right, -- to qualify, this might be the one you do qualify, which qualifies the 1966 session. There's an election going to be called after '66 -- got two years to pay, that's what it says. I haven't paid yet, without interest, I haven't paid, I've got two years to pay. I'm defeated in '66 or I quit in '66; I've said that I want it, I've got 'til '67 to pay; I start collecting right away as soon as I'm defeated. Right or wrong? Is this an amendment that you'll bring this afternoon on this -- right or wrong. Well where am I wrong? Where am I wrong.

MR. STEINKOPF: until you put your money on the line.

MR. DESJARDINS: It doesn't say anything about putting money on the line in here. It says "at the time the person electing to make a contribution, makes the election, or over a period of not more than twenty-four months after the date on which the election is made." -- After the date on which the election is made. And you say that he's got a year to make up his mind if he wants it or not. So technically if this is, let's say it's June 1st. I can wait until next June the 1st to say I want it. June 1st, 1966, right? The session of '66 will be finished, I'll qualify. So on June 1st of next year I say I want it. In July - or maybe in May, that doesn't change anything, the government will go to the people - I'm defeated, I'm out. Only the other thing as soon as I'm defeated if I've had my eight years, I'm eligible, I start collecting. The election is next June, I get my first cheque July 1st, or July 30th, I don't care. I haven't paid a cent yet. I don't have to pay until two years after June 1st, what I said, of 1966 - I don't have to pay until June 1st, of 1968.

Is this right or is this wrong? No answer. Well maybe we'll have another amendment, because this is the only way I can read it.

By the way, so we can get all the amendments together, I would like the honourable members to read on page 2, section 5 subsection (1) "a person who is a member on the coming into force of this Act may at any time within one year after the coming into force of this Act, elect to contribute under this Act in respect of all indemnities paid to him in all years during which he received an indemnity within any continuous period prior to the coming into force of this Act." I would like to have this section clarified by the Minister if he may. Does that mean -- let's say my honourable friend from Lakeside or the Member from Morris or Brandon, anyone, those that have been here quite awhile, or the Member from Logan, does that mean that he can if he wants go all the way back, as long as he puts the money in, or can he go just the last so many years, 8 or 10 years; or can he take the best years as soon as -- let's say, can my honourable friend here take the years that he was in the Cabinet, as long as it continues here? I would like to have this clarified, because it doesn't seem too clear now.

Now as I said before that, I had fixed a card - I'm talking about this business of a man taking it after a 15th session, that might have been at the age of 43, well now he can't take it until 45, and at that time, after putting in, no interest - you can't say that my figures aren't right, there is no interest for us anyway - after putting in \$14,130 he collects \$226,080 - that's after 15 sessions only. That's providing - I'm basing of course the cabinet ministers on the wages that we have now. I didn't bother getting an average and so on, it might be up in the next few years and I know it was a little lower --but I want to be fair, this is based on this. But, or since we had an amendment - and this is brand new, Mr. Chairman - we have 30 years old when he was elected. After 25 years, because he has to be 55 when he collects, but that's not 25 sessions, because the way we have had -- in the last eight years I think there has been, not counting those other sessions, the special session where we received all the indemnity, there has been one anyway, so I think in about 23 years or maybe less - I would say less, because this will only encourage to have more sessions, the ministers will be -- we know this goes on, the public might know, we know what goes on down here, well we'll have an election, let's have another session and so on, so we can have funds to fight this election - this has been mentioned before. This will only encourage that. I'm not saying it necessarily will, but it will tend to this, because the people who want to qualify of another \$10,000 a year or something, it can happen. Now therefore, let's say at age 55, this person can receive \$915.83 a month - that's

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd). a little better than that plan that he compared it with, that's a little better. He was receiving \$100.00 --(Interjection)-- you weren't here. The Minister of Mines and Natural Resources wasn't here, I'm talking about the other Minister.

HON. STERLING R. LYON (Minister of Mines & Natural Resources) (Fort Garry): Mr. Chairman, would the honourable member permit a question? I find it hard to follow his figuring. The figure that he has just used, that would be after a man had been in the cabinet for 23 years? -- to collect the 70 percent you'd have to be in the cabinet 23 years, it's admitted?

MR. DESJARDINS: A little more than 23 years. He would be 55 even if he doesn't pay that much because he wouldn't start collecting before he's 55.

MR. LYON: And the second question is does my honourable friend anticipate that all of the Members of the Cabinet here will be in for 23 years?

MR. DESJARDINS: No, not quite, I think that maybe, I think that maybe another year at the most, but I think that we have to look for the future, we might become as satisfied and as smug and as arrogant as them, and we might decide to do the same thing and I wouldn't want to see that done, so I think that we should in all sincerity be very careful in case we fall in the same pitfalls as our friends and it might be difficult. Well anyway at age 55, they will receive \$915.83 a month -- that's providing as I said that the indemnity and the wages are the same; and I'm sure that they won't be. I'm sure they won't be by that time.

Now let's say that this person lives until age 75. 75 minus the 55 is 20 years. Under this they receive \$219,800.00. Now if he lives another 5 years that's \$274,750.00 --(Interjection)-- My friend says they'll have to increase the heat tax and he's absolutely right. And do you know how much he would have put in, in there? -- \$21,980 or \$22,000.00.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): You'll have us all before that happens.

MR. DESJARDINS: That's what I'm hoping, then I won't need a pension. Of course, you know what happens if I take any welfare business, I'll be out of here; so I have to be careful.

I think that we have to consider a lot of other things when we deal with pension also. We've talked about sacrifice; we've talked about sacrifice; we've talked about priorities; we've talked about everything and we try to have some figures, some were political and those from my honourable friend weren't, but we talked about different sets of figures. Now I think that we have to see if there's really a sacrifice. Now we are receiving \$3,200 plus, don't forget the \$1,600 - \$4,800.00. Are we suffering that much? I'm talking about the members now. All agree that some I understand, and I believe this, some of them might lose a pension and so on, they've got this money to make it up somehow to get a different plan. I said before that everything being equal, not taxing the people on heat, I agree that there is a valid point to discuss the principle of pensions, an adequate and a fair principle of pensions, but I will go, because I said before that this was tailor made, tailor made for the cabinet minister - and I repeat this now - I think that they have hoodwinked the members of the back bench of this party, or some of them anyway, and I say this, now they can tell me, anybody, and I respect all of them, but can they tell me that they are underpaid at \$17,500, plus a car, plus car expenses, plus the general expenses, plus the connection - and I'm not being sarcastic or funny when I say that. You can't tell me - for example, here is a young, smart, intelligent lawyer that was elected, he became a Cabinet Minister right away. He hadn't been out of Law School that long - more power to him - but the point that I am trying to make is this - this is not personality at all - that this man became the head of the department which he worked for. He became the Attorney-General of this Province. Can you tell me that this is going to hurt him as a lawyer later on? He's a Q.C., this is supposed to be a trade, that's not going to hurt him. It wouldn't hurt me if I was there; it wouldn't hurt anybody. It might hurt one - there's one that is a medical man, I think that it might hurt him; he'd have to start his practice all over I guess. I'll admit that. But I can't see that any of the others have suffered that much. I can't see that any lawyer can suffer that much. Don't forget if this party stays up, and I'll mention that for any party, I'm not going to try to blame my honourable friends, he has a good chance of becoming a Judge if he's fairly intelligent. This has happened before. And he has a lot of work - he can receive a little bit of work - the governments have to have a lot of work done by Conservatives. I don't think I'd be wrong in saying that the office firm of Newman, McLean and Beard are receiving a lot of help from here. I don't think they're suffering a bit. And in the past I think that the Liberals have done the same thing, I'll admit that. But this is a point, I'm trying to make a point that nobody's suffering; nobody's suffering because they are sitting here.

MR. PAULLEY: We are now.

MR. DESJARDINS: I think that this is the thing. I'll tell you something - you might be able to get ready to suffer a little longer, because if we can try to stop this, we will; because we don't think this is fair, we think it's a slap in the face to the people of Manitoba - you better be prepared to suffer a little longer.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, will my honourable friend allow me to interrupt him to observe that it's 12.30. What I would suggest to the House is that we might just ask the Chairman to leave the Chair and come back to the Committee again. But if that would happen, I think it would be wise to ask for leave to include in the work of the Committee all the Bills that were reported this morning from the Law Amendments Committee. Now this would be an irregular procedure because normally they would have to come in by motion, but I think in the interests of expedition it would not do any harm or violate any canon of proper procedure if we simply agreed that we just add those Bills to Bill 110 which is now in Committee, so that if we got to them this afternoon, we would be able to deal with them in the Committee and carry on. I wonder if that idea is acceptable to gentlemen opposite?

MR. MOLGAT: What is the advantage of that particular procedure? I just don't see why we don't follow the normal procedure, isn't it simply to move that the Bills be referred to Committee, it's a purely:....

MR. ROBLIN: Well it can be done that way but seeing as we are in Committee it would save the business of having the Speaker come in and have the regular opening and all that kind of thing, so that it would probably be more expeditious. I think it would not do any harm.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agreed. I leave the Chair until 2:30 o'clock this afternoon.