

## THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA.

8:00 o'clock, Monday, May 10th, 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.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to ask the First Minister whether he can provide me with an answer to the question I directed to him at noon today.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier and Provincial Treasurer) (Wolseley): I haven't had an opportunity to look into that matter yet, Madam Speaker.

MR. GUTTORMSON: A subsequent question. When a resident files for his tax rebate, could the Minister indicate approximately how long it will take from the time he contacts the department.

MR. ROBLIN: I can't really give that information as yet. We are just getting the machinery going - some of the cheques are out now.

MR. GUTTORMSON: As I understand it they will be processed as they come in. Is that correct?

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to address a question to the Honourable the Minister of Education. Is provision being made at the University Campus for teachers who will be in training this next year? I understand that students have made application and they are not sure whether they will be able to stay at the residence at the University or not.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): Students attending the new Teachers Department of Education at the University where we hope to have a school open in September for 700 students, these students will be competing for residential accommodation on the same basis as any other University student in the coming year.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to address a question to the Honourable the Provincial Secretary. I am sorry I do not have the Hansard so I can refer to exactly what was said but it was with reference to my questions regarding Stall Lake Mines. Did the Minister in fact make an enquiry himself as a result of the request that was made to him by legal counsel on the 3rd of February 1964?

HON. MAITLAND B. STEINKOPF, Q.C. (Provincial Secretary) (River Heights): Madam Speaker, in reply, the Legal Counsel was in my office and requested a hearing under this section and then at the same time suggested that there would be some legal action and I believe that we both decided that under those conditions it wouldn't be necessary to hold a hearing under this section of the Act.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, a subsequent question. Is it not correct that the Minister was to advise the Legal Counsel who saw him, whether or not the Minister wished to proceed.

My information, according to the letter that I have, is that the Minister was to advise sometime around - on February 4th, as to whether or not it would be granted.

MR. STEINKOPF: Madam Speaker, this I believe is February 4, 1964 and I recall the lawyer in my office after that date, I believe, and I can check this, that it was then decided that there would be no full formal enquiry under that section of the Act.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, a subsequent question. Is it the Minister's opinion then that an enquiry is not required into this affair?

MR. STEINKOPF: Madam Speaker, I'll have to take that as notice because I really can't remember what the facts were on that day.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to address a question to the Honourable the Minister of Public Utilities. On May 3rd, Hansard page 2211, I asked some questions regarding Grand Rapids and whether it was correct that the two units were not producing. The Minister replied to me that sometime last - and I'm quoting now, "sometime last week on inspection of Unit 1 which was taken down, there was found to be some

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd). . . . . adjustments required." Is it correct that this is merely adjustments or is it correct that there are some very serious problems regarding the turbine and the wheels - the blades, concerned with these units?

MR. STEINKOPF: Madam Speaker, the problem I think lies in the blades and the fact that there has been excess vibration in the action of the water going through. How serious the situation is of course won't be known until they've had a chance of taking a good look at the blades, which I understand is a condition that might or might not be normal after there has been the usual run-in of new equipment of this type.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Utilities. I would ask him if he has any information as to the approximate date when the report on the Grand Rapids inquiry might be presented, and if he has such information, could he relate it to us now.

MR. STEINKOPF: Madam Speaker, I have no information on that subject.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I would like to ask a subsequent question to the one that I was asking before. The Minister originally said "some adjustments." My information is it goes far beyond this - there are actually some very serious cracks in the blades of the turbines and that this may leave the equipment out of service for several weeks. Is this correct.

MR. STEINKOPF: Madam Speaker, I believe the equipment will be out for several weeks. On the technical aspect of it I prefer not to venture any kind of an opinion.

MADAM SPEAKER: Committee of the Whole House. The Honourable the Provincial Secretary.

MR. STEINKOPF: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole House to consider the following Bill No. 110, an Act respecting payments to Members of the Legislative Assembly and Ministers of the Crown upon their ceasing to be Members or Ministers of the Crown.

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. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 110 Section 1 pass. . . .

MR. STEINKOPF: Mr. Chairman, one cannot help but put in a day like last Saturday without getting some good suggestions and some good ideas and I think by now you will have before you some suggested amendments to Bill 110. I suggest that when these are in front of you, I would like to go over them item by item and to explain as best I can, what is meant in these suggestions.

The main point in No. 3 of the amendments before you is that the time limit that a member must put in, the number of years before he is eligible, has been amended from 8 sessions to 10 years. This amendment in itself is rather straightforward, but I would like to point out to the honourable members that it should cover the suggestion made by the Honourable Member for Lakeside that it not become effective until after another election - in this way, not benefiting particularly those of us in the front bench of this side of the House. The first year that members on this side were in the Cabinet, the first year was 1958, and ten years from that would make it 1968 and that certainly would be after another election and should I believe, get over the objection held by the Honourable Member for Lakeside.

Under Section 4, you will find the change in the date under which the pension is payable. This is the amendment that was before you the other day in that no pension is payable until the applicant is at least 55 years of age, or should he be under that age limit and wish a pension, then he may do so but for a period of 12 years.

No. 6, you will note that the time limit has been changed under which a member can elect to become a part of the pension plan, and instead of one year it is set as a year from the 1st of June, 1965, or he must elect before the 1st day of June 1966. The reason for this was that there is a retroactive feature to this bill in the final clause that makes it effective January 1st 1965 and under the terms of that section it would have only given the member a little more than seven months under which to elect.

Sections 9, 10, 11, 12 of the amendment apply to Part 2 of the bill and to - in the same way to the Ministers, the Leader of the Opposition, the Speaker and the Deputy Speaker.

(MR. STEINKOPF cont'd). . . . . Section 13 clarifies the situation whereby a member will receive his pension after all the payments due have been made and although this was never contemplated nor would it have been permitted under the terms of the contract that would have been entered into, we thought it advisable to just clarify that, spell it out as we did.

Section 15. the amendment has been clarified in the supplementary piece of paper that we've just had distributed, but in effect it says the same thing as Section 15 and that means that there is no pension payable under either Part 1 or Part 2 of this bill, to a judge or to anyone who is receiving an annuity under The Judges' Act, or if he holds a full-time judicial or semi-judicial appointment, or is a member of the Senate or the House of Commons or the Legislature of any of the other provinces of Canada, including this one, or is employed in full-time employment by the Government of Canada, the Government of Manitoba or the government of any other province of Canada.

The amendments, I think, cover the suggestions that have been made, and of course if there are others we would hope that the Members of the Opposition would point them out. bring them up clear at this time so that any suggestions they have will be given serious consideration.

While I'm on my feet I would like to bring to the attention of the House, and as a matter of record, part of an editorial that occurred in the Free Press on May 5th, 1965. So much has been read into the record that has been written by the Tribune that I thought it only fair that both sides of the matter of pensions be given an airing, and I quote from the Free Press of May 5th. It says "Is such a program for Manitoba MLAs necessary and desirable? In the case of Cabinet Ministers or the Leader of the Opposition, people whose governmental duties fill the entire year, the answer is yes. The job of a Cabinet Minister is full-time. Because of this he tends to drift away from the profession or business at which he earned his living before entering politics. As a result, when the day comes that he has to go back to private life, he is often under a severe handicap because of his prolonged absence. A pension for such people does not seem unreasonable nor does the scale of pensions proposed by Mr. Steinkopf" - then it goes on to talk generally about the pension plan --(Interjection)-- Want it all? "But the ordinary MLA is in another category. Normally the Legislature sits for about two months out of 12. Admittedly an MLA is not entirely free of his duties and responsibilities toward his constituents for the other 10 months, but these are not usually of so onerous a nature as to handicap him severely in the normal earning of his living, nor is his absence during the two months that the Legislature sits. It may be questioned therefore, if a pension plan for MLAs can be justified. Certainly the proposal is one that should get the most careful examination. This is particularly so since it appears to be going to cost the Manitoba taxpayer some \$20,000 a year. This plan will be on a contributory basis with participants contributing a percentage of their salary or indemnity. But because of the small number of people involved the plan cannot be implemented on an actuarial basis -- that is, it would not pay its own way. The Treasury, which means the taxpayer, will have to pay out the necessary \$20,000 a year to make it workable." --(Interjection)--

That's all there is; I can't read any more. But if you would like I can read something that was in the Tribune tonight on which I have some comment to make. I'm not one to argue with the press because I don't think I could ever win it - unlike some of my friends - but in their editorial of this evening they do again bring out some figures that might be misleading and certainly not on a par with what one would consider a fair average figure in the matter of pensions. I think that the columnist who wrote the article would still welcome another opinion and at the expense of creating his ire again, I hope to do that.

Incidentally I had heard Saturday, within two or three hours of the time that I had brought to his attention the unfairness of the figure that he quoted, that he would be making a reply even before he had a factual statement of what I had said and I think the result of the article that is written in this evening's Tribune is of some information - certainly it must have been secondhand, unless some of our friends in the Press Gallery are also the columnists - the editorial writers.

I don't think that in my remarks on Saturday, I said that it would cost the taxpayer \$23,000 a year. I said the average over a very long period of time could be \$23,000.00. My statements I think, have always been based on an average over a number of years and not just for any one particular year. I took the example that he also so often has referred to, and which looks like the most obnoxious of all the situations that we can find ourself in in preparing a pension. and that is of the young man who comes in here at 21, stays for the minimum number

(MR. STEINKOPF cont'd). . . . . of eight years, and then decides to go on pension and this, once you have an actuarial fact to start with, there is no problem in coming up with a figure as to what the pension will cost - and using that figure and the basis of \$3,200.00 a year salary, and for the eight years, I found that the cost of that pension would be \$1,792.00 if it were placed with an insurance company or with anyone to buy a pension of the required amount at the age of 55, which is a considerably less amount than what I even thought of when I was talking about it on Saturday last. Of that \$1,792.00, the member would have paid himself some \$1,536.00 and the amount payable by the Treasury or the taxpayer would have only been in total \$256.00, and in the event of a death before 55, he would have received back, or his estate would have, the \$1,536.00, and of course it wouldn't have cost the taxpayer even the \$256.00. Now it's quite possible that one can take any figure and come up with any set of figures but if it is the choice of a newspaper to pick up the worst kind of a situation, may I suggest that it is only fair that we take one of the best kind of situations that could exist.

Probably the members will want to know from which source my figures come and I may say that they came from the very same source from which the respectable editor of The Winnipeg Tribune got his. But yet one would wonder why there is such a difference between this seemingly small figure and the much much larger one that has been quoted. Well it's a very simple thing in that an insurance company or whoever figures on an annuity, or even the government, where as we would in the superannuation plan, we figure the use of our own money and it makes a big difference if the user of the money has a much longer term to use it. The \$1,700.00 used at a factor of six percent over some 26-27 years would produce enough in interest to fund it at 55, to give the pension of \$54.00 that we were talking about. On the other hand, if you were to take a situation where someone was to go on pension at 55, and having come into this Assembly just eight years previously, and not even considering the amount of money that he had put up during the eight years, and asking anyone to plan a pension at 55 and ask how much it would cost, for life, with guaranteed payment, it would be quite a substantial amount more. One must consider the generalities connected with the passing - the principle behind this bill. I've sat in this session now and I've been a member since the '63 session, this session has been to me a rather fruitful one. We've seen almost 150 bills passed, all of them progressive, well thought out legislation --(Interjection)-- I beg your pardon?

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): When was that?

MR. STEINKOPF: This year --(Interjection)-- They're the type of bills too, that as one who has been a citizen and a taxpayer of this province for a long time, I feel that the taxpayers would be very happy with and the citizens would be happy with, and is proof that the welfare of the citizens of this province is certainly in pretty capable hands. The legislation that was prepared and passed by the Roblin government has litterly leapfrogged the big stagnant abyss that I was used to as an ordinary citizen for many years, of what one we always used to call the "do nothing government", and is so farsighted, that the remnants of the former government, members that are still in this House, I don't think can really catch up. I am sure too that some of the financial men of the Liberal Party - they are all well-known to us, they are all well to do reactionaries of the highest order - who always would oppose pensions for Legislature as they oppose unions for their own shops or their own businesses. But I feel that the great middle class and the working man really know how important a pension is. Only the other day, I ran into Sam Goodman and he told me - a well known labour leader - and he told me that he thought that the Roblin government was the best government that this province has ever had. That's coming from a union man. --(Interjection)-- Someone I think has --(Interjection)-- Oh, I'm convinced. I just bring this out to show you that I don't get too impressed by the harsh words that were said here the other day and will probably be continued to be said, and that we should run for cover, there's a big wind blowing and that we'll all be swept out of power at the next election. I'll take my chances on that. I'm very confident, and feel a lot more confident over the weekend, by the many telephone calls that I got from my own constituents to say how pleased they were with the type of stand that we were taking in the legislation that we were putting forward. And. . . . .

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Who called you? The other members of the Cabinet?

MR. STEINKOPF: Yes, sir. Quite a few of them live in my constituency --(Interjection) -- They certainly weren't the same people who called you on your radio program this morning. I sort of feel --(Interjection)-- I love to be amused early in the morning --(Interjection)-- Someone has told the member that we're having a little fun with him tonight. also the

(MR. STEINKOPF cont'd). . . . Honourable Member for Portage and I don't see the Honourable Member for Burrows, in his seat, that the best defence is a pretty good offence. --(Interjection)-- Pardon?

MR. DESJARDINS: He's on the next shift. . . .

MR. STEINKOPF: Okay. Well, whatever he's got. I don't know how you spell it but if he's got it --(Interjection)-- A good defence is a good offence, which I think might not be so --(Interjection)-- which might work in hockey, but I'm sure isn't worth a penny in building good statute law. I think the greedy hand speech of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface is really not a good offence - if it's anything, it's not even good offensive. I think that that speech will be around for a long time to haunt him, and in the not too distant future something that he will have cause to regret. Because in that speech and in other speeches, I think he's lowered the dignity and the high regard that the people of Manitoba have had for this Legislature, not just today but over the many years. Now I don't think he's too impressed, nor did I intend to have any effect on him, because I'm not that eloquent that I can do it, but there may be some who will have that effect on him. Or in the same manner that he belittles some of the decisions that the Speaker has made in this House. I think that the - he holds himself out as speaking for the people of Manitoba. This is quite a nice position to put yourself into. I thought that was usually reserved for a statesman or man of real stature in this business, but if he feels he's come to that stature already, I say more power to him. But I think for the time being he'd be wise to speak for himself, or his little party over there and for the members that he represents. I'm sure that there's a great big segment of Manitoba in, certainly near where I live, that would just as soon have someone else speak for them as have the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, if he wants to speak in the way he did here on Saturday. --(Interjection)-- Well you come over and run. There are no more son-in-laws left to run. You come on over and run. You come and run against me and we'll have a little bit of fun over there.

It's I think, mature on our part to listen to constructive criticism and when there was any constructive criticism that came forward, we tried to glean it from the many speeches that were made and I believe have come up with some fair amendments which should make the bill plausible. I was under the impression on Saturday that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, who I believe is leading the attack for the Liberal Party, that he was in favour of the principle of pensions, but today on his program when he was asked whether he was in favour of a pension or not, he was quite definite in saying that he was not in favour --(Interjection)-- of a pension. So I really don't know whether we're debating the principle of a pension or not, or whether we're debating the term of the plan that we have put before you. I know that there's no pension plan set up that is perfect. I think that for those who are in the process or in the employment, or as we are in this House, that it can't be equality for all: it can't even be equitable for all, because all of our positions are static and at the time the plan is put in it affects each and every one of us in a different fashion. If we get into personalities we can make poor law for even poor cases.

I think that anyone who has had anything to do with putting in a pension plan in an operation even much larger than this, as I have had, have known that it had to be adjusted from time to time. Even our well run Civil Service Superannuation Plan is not the last word in plans to many of those who were in at the time that the plan was made effective. There's hardly a month goes by, that I do not receive some complaint or other from a civil servant who has long since been on pension, complaining, and I think justifiably so, that the amount of money that he gets now doesn't buy as much as it did when the dollars that he put in many, many years ago. We have tried over the last few years to improve the benefits as the interest rates go up under the pension plan and to still keep it sound actuarially. It has been well conceived. It is well run. I suggest that as each year goes on this plan too will be well run, will be well planned - and it may have to be amended. I do not think that if it does, that we need to take any shame for the fact that it was amended. I hope that the debate now can continue on a constructive basis, that if there is any criticism or any suggestions on the amendment that have been made, that the honourable members of the Liberal Party will be free to give them to us, and I can assure you that over here we'll give them a very attentive ear.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, that was certainly a very interesting speech that we heard, and rambling as it did, over a very wide field, I can see that it will provide the members this evening with certainly a good deal of variety of material that can be brought into the discussion. Because it coursed over a number of other items apart from the subject directly at

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd). . . . . hand, such as labour law and the progressive, or so-called progressive attitude of the present government, and many other things. I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that later on in the discussion this evening that we'll have time to cover those subjects.

I wish to deal with some other specifics at this time. I might say that I'm happy about one thing this evening. On Saturday, when the Honourable Minister spoke I was on my feet and about to speak at that time, I was going to give some words of advice to my honourable friend, because he was approaching or using the same technique on Saturday night, that he has used on other occasions in debates here. And while I am a much younger man than he is, Mr. Chairman, I think I might give him some sound advice as to operations in this House. And that is that when you make a blooper like this one, when you bring in a bill that is as sick as this one, you don't run and hide behind personality and cry "dirty", when other people start criticizing it in a perfectly sound way. You accept the criticism and don't do what you did on Saturday night when you started bleating again as you are wont to do on many occasions. I warn my honourable member to try some other techniques in this House, and when he makes a mistake not to start crying "McCarthyism" as he did in a previous debate in this House or to cry "dirty" as he did on Saturday night.

MR. STEINKOPF: When the label . . . . .

MR. MOLGAT: That has nothing to do with the issue at hand. Because, Mr. Chairman, the Minister has given us the best example tonight as to why this bill should be withdrawn. The very best example possible. And when he says that he's accepting our suggestions, I'll admit that he's accepting some of the specific criticisms we've made of the bill, but he's not accepting our main suggestion - in fact not suggestion, Mr. Chairman, it's a motion that this bill be withdrawn or referred to an outside committee where it can get proper study. Because just look at what has happened in this whole sad history of the bill, Mr. Chairman. First of all, I have now checked my figures carefully, it was deposited on our desk here at 8:45 at night on Monday the 3rd of May. The first time that we had an opportunity to see this bill. It came up for second reading the following afternoon, Tuesday the 4th of May, which would hardly be giving the members a long period of time to study the bill and its provisions, when they had had no prior information on the bill whatever. Tuesday afternoon the 4th of May, it was adjourned by my colleague the Honourable the Member for Lakeside. It was called back for debate again on Wednesday morning the 5th of May at which time there was a considerable amount of debate that went on. It was back again for debate on Thursday afternoon the 6th of May; again there was a considerable amount of debate. The Minister closed the debate and the vote was called and that vote was very clear: my honourable friends to my left supported the government completely with the exception of yourself, Mr. Chairman, and the Member for Rhineland, and ourselves, were the ones who voted against this. So here we were, from Monday night to Thursday afternoon - meanwhile the House was sitting every day, three separate sessions from 9:30 in the morning till 11 or 12 at night. This is how much opportunity the members had to study it. On Friday morning the 7th of May the Bill was referred to the Committee of the Whole. And what happened, Mr. Chairman? Well then we got amendment No. 1, two pages of amendments to a Bill that the Minister told us subsequently had been studied for years - been working on it for years he told the House. The reason he gave the House that it hadn't come in until the last few days of the session was that he had been studying it so thoroughly and he and his colleagues in the Conservative Caucus had spent so much time studying the Bill, so much time making sure that it was the right bill, that they couldn't bring it in previously and yet by Friday morning at 9:40 we are handed a sheaf of amendments. Well the debate continued. We raised further objections - we had very little information as a matter of fact at that time regarding the comparisons to other provinces. Finally late on Saturday night, the Minister got up and read some figures to the House regarding provisions in other jurisdictions as compared to the proposed bill here and so on.

Today when the bill was called, or rather when the House was called, the Minister suggested he had further amendments. Then at ten minutes before three this afternoon the members were handed two sheets, one of them is dated May 3rd and is entitled "Pension Funds payable to Cabinet Ministers and Members of Legislative Assemblies" and it lists the various provinces. The other one has no heading on it but is presumably the application of the proposed plan of the Minister to specific conditions here in Manitoba, and it lists, for example, - Members indemnity over the years '59 to '65; Ministers Salaries years '59 to '65; Speaker salary '63 to '70, for some reason; Salary of the Opposition Leader '62 to '69; Salary Deputy Speaker '65 to '72 and a summary. This was at ten minutes to three this afternoon, Mr.

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd).....Chairman. Lo and behold, at 5:20 we receive three pages of amendments this time, a full three pages to a bill that's been studied for years, a bill that my honourable friends have been caucusing steadily apparently to make sure that it was right. So here we are, we get three pages of amendments, and what do we find Mr. Chairman, when we check these amendments? Well we find that the information given to us at 10 minutes to 3 this afternoon doesn't even relate to the amendments that were given to us at 20 minutes after 5 on the same afternoon; because this now switches things to being 10 years instead of 8 sessions and all the calculations I see here insofar as the projection of this Bill that we are supposed to decide on is based on 8 years, the bill as it was previously. So presumably at 10 minutes to 3 this afternoon, when these are handed to us, the government policy is 8 sessions before you get a pension; at 20 minutes after 5, it's become 10 years before you get a pension. So we come back here this evening and lo and behold what do we get? - version 3 of the amendments, Mr. Chairman, distributed to this House at 8:10 tonight. A third set of amendments to the same Bill which my honourable friends say has been studied so carefully.

Mr. Chairman, is there any better proof that this bill should simply be withdrawn? It's obvious that the government has not given this matter any thought. How can the Minister stand there and tell us that we should support this bill - in fact it was strongly recommended to us in the first place and the greatest proponent of the bill was the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. He gave us a glowing speech here the other day as to why we should accept the bill in its original version, in its original state, as is, Mr. Chairman; and that anyone who wouldn't support that proposition was an niggling, quibbling fellow - wasn't that his words? - absolutely. People just niggling and quibbling because we wouldn't accept the bill as it was. And lo and behold since then, three sets of amendments in rapid succession. Mr. Chairman, who's trying to kid who? I don't know when this bill was hatched or who hatched it, but it should have been kept way out of this House because it smells right from the beginning and the actions of the government --(interjection)-- does my honourable friend wish to make a speech? If the Minister of Welfare would like to make a speech I'd like to hear from him, because he gave an interesting speech here the other day.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Welfare) (The Pas): It was a good one.

MR. MOLGAT: Yes, I intend to read it back to you as time goes on. Because he gave an interesting speech the other day about poverty, about the war on poverty that he was conducting --(interjection)-- my honourable friend the Minister of Welfare is conducting a war on poverty and he believes, Mr. Chairman, on beginning where poverty is the greatest; right there in the front row. Poverty stricken fellows! You've got to start at the right place I agree.

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Charity begins at home.

MR. MOLGAT: I shall be very happy to read my honourable friend the Minister of Welfare before the debate is over, the interesting things he had to say about poverty, because when you compare them to the bill which we were so strongly encouraged to support in its original form, well one wonders about the attitude of people, one wonders exactly what is meant by poverty. So, Mr. Chairman, I say to the government, you are making a grave mistake. We have told you this several times now, why don't you simply withdraw this bill and admit that it was a poorly devised bill; that there has been no thought given to it and that the whole affair needs a great deal more consideration obviously than has been given to it to date or that can be given to it in a Committee like this.

Mr. Chairman, there are other examples, or shall I say other proof that the government itself agrees to this. The Honourable Member for Brandon, when he was speaking on Saturday said - and I think I'm quoting him right, although I do not have the Hansard - he said that this whole matter needs another look. I think those were his words. Well if I'm misquoting him I'll.....

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): I think the honourable member is mistaken. I'm pretty certain that I never said those words in that - unless he's taken them out of context in some other reference.

MR. MOLGAT: Well as I said, Mr. Chairman, I don't have the Hansard and I can only go according to the note I made at that time. If that isn't what he said, I'll be pleased to wait until the Hansard comes and see exactly what it is. Then another member of the committee, when we were discussing comparisons of this pension plan to pension plans elsewhere the Minister of Welfare got into the Act and he was discussing pensions of judges and.....

MR. CARROLL: I just asked a question.....

MR. MOLGAT: You weren't discussing pensions of Judges? Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd). . . . . awfully surprised if he wasn't because I can quite well recall he asked a question I think of the Member for St. George.

MR. CARROLL: I just asked a question. I wasn't discussing it.

MR. MOLGAT: Well then he asked a question regarding pensions for judges, and if judges got pensions, why not us? I think was the gist of the conversation. Then it turned out lo and behold that he didn't know what sort of a pension judges got, because he intimated they got it at age 65 and . . . . .

MR. CARROLL: Look it up if you want to quote. . . . .

MR. MOLGAT: Well, I'm sorry I can't look it up because I haven't got Hansard.

MR. CARROLL: Well then don't quote it if you don't know.

MR. MOLGAT: Well let's put it this way then. My honourable friend didn't know what pension judges got because he asked the Member for St. George what pension they got, and the Member for St. George told them that they got pensions at age 75. Is that a fair statement of what went on? Well then my honourable friend will have to correct it, because that's my note.

So we have honourable gentlemen from the far side, who themselves agree it needs more looking into. The Minister himself who introduces the bill, he has now been running - a running discussion with the Tribune. He didn't agree with their figures the other day. He doesn't agree with their figures today. The figures aren't right. Well I don't know if they are right or if they are wrong, Mr. Chairman, but it only proves this - that there hasn't been enough time for anyone to find out if the figures are right or wrong, because this matter needs a good deal of study. It's not something that can be decided just like that. The Minister shakes his head. He thinks it can be decided just like that. Well if it can be decided just like that, how come is it that he supplies us with three sets of amendments to one bill in the course of one week? How can he possibly say that the matter can be discussed very readily if he can't make up his mind himself as to what sort of a bill it should be - goes down the line.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to compare the action of the government on this particular bill, to what they have done in other cases of pensions. What's been the position of the Government of Manitoba, the present government, with regards to other pension plans? Well sometime ago, I guess it's about three years ago now, the Government of Ontario introduced legislation to make portable pensions. Now these aren't for MLAs, these are for people, people as a whole -- the group that we're sent here to take care of. The Province of Ontario proceeded with this. The Government of Manitoba subsequently indicated some interest in the matter of portability of pensions and it was discussed here. What was done, Mr. Chairman? Well, it was referred to the Legislature's Standing Committee on Statutory Orders and Regulations. That's what the government did with the portable pension plan. Very close to what I'm suggesting they do with this one - but I suppose that's a different thing. There we are dealing with the people at large. Here we are dealing with ourselves. What happened, Mr. Chairman, when this was referred to the Statutory Orders and Regulations Committee? Well I have here a headline - it's from the Winnipeg Tribune, June 1964, "Chamber raps Duff's Pension Plan." "The Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce, Thursday termed the Manitoba government's proposed portable pension scheme 'a curious form of penalty' for benevolent employers. In a five page brief to the Legislature's Standing Committee on Statutory Orders and Regulations, the Chamber questioned the need for such legislation, called it a further intrusion on management prerogatives and argued against the rather broad and arbitrary powers it would give a single board. The brief presented on behalf of Edson Boyd, President of the Chamber, noted the Canada Pension Plan is expected to come out shortly and that it's basic purpose is to provide a minimum basic pension. The Chamber felt this is essentially what the Manitoba Legislation is aimed at. The Chamber felt any action on pensions in Manitoba should be deferred until the federal scheme is out. The burden of costs of drafting pension schemes should be borne by private enterprise rather than by the government the brief said. The Chamber felt the compromise arrangement should be made between the provinces and the Federal Government in connection with the setting up of a minimum pension scheme.

It visualized the following advantages under the federal plan: uniformity of legislation across Canada to correct serious discrepancies between various provincial pension bills. The transfer of employees between provinces could be effected without causing undue paper work or disturbance. More consistent, effective and economical administration and supervision should result. As far as the Manitoba scheme would affect employers, the Chamber felt it is hard to justify special statutory compulsion directed solely against the employers who voluntarily establish pension plans when it is remembered that they must face competition from



(MR. MOLGAT cont'd) . . . . . others who bear no such burden. Then there are others appeared: D. C. Bjornason and R. L. Jex, also appeared before the Standing Committee, Thursday to submit briefs from The Canadian Life Insurance Officers Association and Great-West Life. They both agreed with the Chamber of Commerce position that uniformity of pension legislation should be attained in the ten provinces. They also argued that the Manitoba Government Plan of establishing a central pension board gives promise of increasing pension costs for Manitoba employees and thereby adversely affecting the competitive of Manitoba employers. Both briefs however agreed with the basic purpose of the Act, to establish, extend and improve pension plans in the province.

What did the government do, Mr. Chairman, with this? What did they do, after having heard these briefs at the Committee on Statutory Orders and Regulations? The very committee where I suggested this pension plan should go. Well, I'm quoting again from the Tribune - "Committee Puts Bill Debate Over. The Legislature's Standing Committee on Statutory Orders and Regulations Thursday delayed consideration of the government's proposed portable pension bill until Premier Duff Roblin has discussed uniformity of pension legislation with other premiers later this summer." It went on to say that "The committee also agreed to postpone further consideration of two other bills before it for several months until a special committee of The Manitoba Bar Association has had the opportunity to study them, and it left it to the Chairman, Stewart McLean, to decide when to meet again to consider the remaining four bills which include The Unconscionable Transactions Act. All are left open for further representation from the public. Premier Roblin said outside the committee that changes in both Federal and Ontario pension legislation since the Manitoba Act was drafted necessitated reconsideration of the Act. Portability of pension was on the agenda for the Premiers' meeting." I'd like to point out, Mr. Chairman, that at that very time it's the present Minister who is introducing this bill, who was dealing with quite a few of these bills, a number of them before that committee were directly from my honourable friends.

Same thing in the Winnipeg Free Press - approximately the same date, June, 1964 - "Premiers' talks delay pension bill. Private companies will probably be allowed to wait at least another nine months before they are required to register their pension plans with the Manitoba Government" - and on and on. So there we are, Mr. Chairman. This government brought before this House the idea of portable pensions for the people of Manitoba - not for the members of this House, for the people of Manitoba. What do we do with it? Well, we send it to the Committee on Statutory Orders and Regulations. We have it studied by the committee. What does the committee do? The committee, at the suggestion of the Premier, I take it, decides not to proceed on this and what's happened to portable pensions since? Puff-disappeared. We haven't heard about it since.

This was the action of the government, Mr. Chairman, on a pension bill affecting the people of the province. It was good enough for the people of Manitoba to send it to a committee for study. It was the right thing to do then - send it out to be studied. The Minister can't say it was new, because it had already been done in the Province of Ontario. It wasn't a brand new idea or something that the government couldn't have checked out themselves, but they sent it to the committee, and I agree that they were right.

On this bill, Mr. Chairman, what's the action of the government? Bring it into this House quickly at the end of the session, rush it through in the hopes that the members won't even find out what's in it and put it into effect. Mr. Chairman, if that first bill, the bill that was originally placed before us, had gone into force in the Province of Manitoba, it would have been a scandalous situation. Absolutely scandalous when you look at the provisions of that bill and the type of pensions that it provided to some of the members of this House. Mr. Chairman, I can speak in this matter as one who's involved, because my position is directly involved in that bill, the position of the Leader of the Opposition. I'm one of those who stood to benefit personally by this bill and I say that the provisions of the bill for the Cabinet Ministers in particular, and for the Leader of the Opposition, are ridiculous provisions. The Minister said it's the same as in other provinces. I say to him go and look what goes on in other provinces. Go and look what goes on in the Ottawa House. And I'll have more to say about that later on.

Mr. Chairman, this government has shown before, in the case of portable pensions that they should not be passed by this House without study; that they should be sent outside to the committee. Why is it now that they insist on ramming this through this House? Why is it that they insist on proceeding with this bill in the way that they are? Mr. Chairman, I repeat, these

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd). . . . . amendments are the perfect proof that this bill is not fit to be passed by this House. They're the perfect proof that the government didn't know itself what was in the legislation to begin with. I don't know how many of the cabinet ministers knew; I suspect that none of the backbenchers knew. I'd certainly like to hear from them as to whether they approve of Bill No. 110 as it first came in here.

Mr. Chairman, there's only one thing to do with this bill, in fairness to the members of this House, in fairness to the people of the province, and that's to send it out of this House to a Committee where it can be studied properly and where we can find out whether it is a desirable bill to bring in. I said in my comments last week, I'm not convinced that there should be pensions for members of this House. I have to be convinced on this yet. I'm not convinced that people that are here on a part-time basis require pensions. I'm not convinced that people who get \$400.00 a month indemnity in this House - that's what all of us get - minimum - \$400.00 per month - which is substantially more than the average wage in the province. We're getting that for part-time work. I have to be convinced yet that we require pensions after eight or ten years here. And I say to the government, withdraw the bill; send it outside to a committee. It's the only right thing to do.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I didn't intend to speak in this debate but every time I see my honourable friend the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, he asks me when are you going to make a speech on the pension? Now as we are the best of friends, I thought that maybe I should satisfy him. After all, we won't see each other for a year, maybe we'll never see each other if there's an election, not in this House anyway, so I thought I should please him and say a few words.

I think that one of the things that we should start by is, what he said when he defended this position of this Bill. First of all he said we shouldn't waste too much time discussing pensions for legislators. That's the first thing that he said and I'm sure that's the first thing that he wanted - he wanted us to have a vote immediately on that day and pass the pension and go home. He said that the pension would help some members from living a life of hardship in their advancing years. I think I would subscribe to this - \$588.00 a month or so, or even \$314.00 that he qualifies for, I think this would help quite a bit.

Now he was replying to charges that I made that the Ministers were feathering their own nests under this proposed pension scheme and he said, suggested if such were the case, the Member from St. Boniface in the House of Commons, Roger Teillet, the Minister of Veterans' Affairs must be equally guilty under the Pearson Government pension plan. Well I was under the impression that I was the Member for St. Boniface in this Legislature. I didn't know that St. Boniface was permitted two members. I didn't know that Roger Teillet, or the Honourable Roger Teillet, would have a chance to vote on this pension.

Then he said, he doesn't like these emotional speeches that I make. I took a - one of my friends gave me a pill today so I wouldn't be too emotional, so. . . . . And he said --(Interjection)-- a blue one - "whose emotional attacks on government proposal have angered more than one of the members of the Roblin administration during the current session" - I was very surprised to hear that. I had no intention at all. And it says "It's just not good enough in this day and age, he told Mr. Desjardins, to stand up like a bull in a china shop, going after every straw man in sight; you have to have some substance. Mr. Lyon said that he was glad Mr. Desjardins had opposed the pension legislation as that is probably the best indication that it, the bill, is right."

Now that's what my honourable friend said. Well, I wonder if he's so happy now that I did speak, because when he started, I think with those cards, those flash cards that I had, I think I showed where he could make quite a bit of money. I think I had an idea where he could collect, after 13 sessions, no 13 years, 15 sessions, he could collect approximately \$7,065.00. --(Interjection)-- Oh, yes, a year. Well, one day after I wonder if he's so happy. There was an amendment and he has just lost \$84,480, because he could not get his pension until he was 55 instead of 43. So he just lost, my honourable friend lost \$84,780 by one chop -- just that one amendment. So there was no substance in what we had said, but for charity and all that they thought they'd pull back \$84,000 practically \$85,000.00. Oh, yes, this is just on one Minister. And that's not the maximum either; the maximum could have been 10,000 times - what is - just a second, Mr. Chairman. I have so many notes here - the maximum would be 10,990 - 11,000 multiplied by 12, instead of 7,000 so that was it. Today you lost another few dollars because now it's not eight sessions, it's 10 years so that could be maybe three sessions or so, that might be another \$21,000 that my honourable friend lost. Then they had a good deal

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd). . . . . - he could start collecting before he had put a cent in the plan - remember that? My honourable friend the Minister who brought this in shook his head - no - today we've got an amendment - exactly that. We've got an amendment. Mind you they had really studied - this was a plan that had taken years and years and years to prepare. This is what my honourable friend said. Now mind you, the Honourable Member for Selkirk doesn't believe that. The Honourable Member from Lakeside doesn't believe that. I'm sure that my Leader doesn't believe that. The Member from Neepawa doesn't believe that either. The Member from St. George, I don't think he believes either, nor the Member from Emerson. I don't think that any of the members behind me either, the Member of Portage doesn't believe that; nor the Member from Assiniboia, and not even the Member from Steinback -- and you Mr. Chairman, you don't believe that. Not the way you voted. I know that the honourable member, the Leader of the NDP - of the Social -- oh no. no -- the Social Credit doesn't believe that. Not even the Whip of the Social Credit believes that. No member of the Social Credit Party believe that. Now, there are so many people that don't believe that I don't remember what they don't believe.

Well, Mr. Chairman, instead of having one year to pay, or two years to pay, there was an amendment there was one year to pay. That's going to be a little tougher on my honourable friend the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, the former Attorney-General. Then, as I said awhile ago, he can't collect until he's put every single cent in. That's odd for a plan. It was a much better deal on Thursday when it came in. It was much better. Now they've brought two amendments but he's not going to lose anything on that, because tonight -- well that's the latest; I didn't check with the Whip of the party. There might be some other amendments now. This is the one we got just about 8 o'clock. There's been two? Well, there's another amendment that he cannot collect his pension - another thing that we heard from the Honourable Minister - we could not collect this pension while sitting here as a MLA. Well, once he's out, he's going to go right out; so I don't think he's going to lose any money on that. By the way things look now, I don't think he'd ever get elected to the House of Commons and I don't think that he'll ever be a Senator or a Judge, so he didn't lose too much on that. But nevertheless he lost between 85 and \$100,000 on certain things that didn't make any sense and he was pleased that I was against the bill -- Well!

Now the next thing, there's my honourable friend the Minister who brought this in. Today he thought he'd get one friend. He was going to tell us about an editorial in the Winnipeg Free Press. He said this and this and this and this, and he quoted - then he said, "then they went on." Just what did they go on? The Free Press said "certainly the proposal is one that should get the most careful examination." This is what we're saying. Send it in committee; let's study it. Most careful examination. Mind you, we must have somebody other than the untouchables in the front benches, because if this was after year and years and years - which mind you, nobody here believes that it took those many years - but if it took that long to study and in two days they come in with fifteen amendments, - not a week - well three days: Friday we got some and now, Friday, Saturday and over the weekend. Now I think they need somebody else to help them. And the Free Press said, "certainly the proposal is one that should get the most careful examination." This is particularly so since it appears to be going to cost the Manitoba taxpayers some \$20,000 a year. They said even with just \$20,000 a year, that it would cost more. Well it's not going to - the Free Press made a mistake. I think we have to admit that. It trusted and believed what the Minister said when he introduced the subject, when he introduced the bill, the Minister said that it would cost only \$20,000.00. I think that - well we might as well see where he said this. He said - this is what he said about his figures, it was supposed to be the Gospel truth and he said, "Well, Mr. Steinkopf, the pension plan would cost the public about \$20,000 a year." The Minister admitted this was his own calculation and said that a friend in the insurance business had told him, "Your guess is as good as mine." This is what we're supposed to - a lot of study. We're supposed to base ourself on that, and a friend said, "Your guess is as good as mine." He said he had produced a tailor-made guess after calculating the probabilities in the next election, studying the average age of MLAs and considering their state of health. The Minister said his proposed amendment would make the \$20,000 estimate even more realistic than before.

Now I think that we can see now that it would cost much more than that. In fact, I have some figures here that says that - mind you for the maximum pension of a Minister we would have to have a capital of \$140,000; and for a \$314 pension - somebody taking this thing from age 40, it would take \$62,000.00. And then I am told that the taxpayer will pay at least half

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) . . . . . of all this, at a five percent interest, not at six percent interest like my honourable friend says. So. I think that if the Free Press was wrong, if the Free Press made a mistake, it was in believing that the 20,000 might be the correct amount.

Now my honourable friend said that we had a fruitful session. I don't think I understand the definition of the word "fruitful". I remember that, I remember that my honourable colleague, the Member from LaVerendrye, brought in a resolution to help the farmers something about gas. And all of a sudden, we weren't talking about gas at all, we - the licence plates were reduced back to what they were before they had been brought up on January 1st.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will the Honourable Member please keep to the motion. The motion before this House, is that this Bill be not proceeded with at this session but be referred to the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The Minister when he spoke told us about - he glorified the labour laws of the Roblin government; he told us what Mr. Sam Goodman thought about them; about the election in River Heights. He ranged very widely and

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . . . order doesn't make everybody else in order.

MR. MOLGAT: Well, but Mr. Chairman, if he was allowed to do it, then why not the Honourable Member for St. Boniface? Surely the Minister ranged all over the place and I made a particular point, Mr. Chairman, when I got up, to point out that he had done so. had not been called out of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You should have brought it to my attention. --(Interjection)-- If I didn't get it, you should have brought it to my attention. I don't get every point when people are. . . . .

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I brought out at that time that. . . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: One of the rules of this House is - there are very very few rules when we are in committee but there are two: One, that the speeches must be relevant; and two, there must not be repetition. I would ask the members of the House to observe those two rules. There are not very many and are rules that we should surely respect -- the orders and rules of this House.

MR. DESJARDINS: . . . . . Mr. Chairman, I - well I thought that we were here discussing pension of the people and I think that anytime you discuss a pension - if this was a business or so - you talk about pension, I think that you'd want to know what those people are doing to earn these pensions. I think that we've been talking about - try to encourage a better type of people and I think that the Minister himself stated, how much these people - because I think they also admit that this is tailor-made for the front bench and I think that this is - it's fine to bring up - I think maybe we should bring up something about this fruitful session. But if you think that - you don't think I should reply to him, show him how fruitful we think the session is. You think this would have nothing to do with the pension? In other words it's not important what they've done, as long as they get the pension.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . . . keep to this motion.

MR. DESJARDINS: It's more important to keep to the motion, Mr. Chairman, as far as we're concerned here, but I think that maybe we should be a little . . . . . I think of the people of Manitoba. I think they would say it's more important to see what the people are doing to earn these big salaries in the Session; but if you say that this is so, I won't bring this anymore - I had many pages here to show the fruitful session that we had, but I'll put this away.

We might then bring out the question of the principle of the pension. It was said, the honourable minister stated that I said that I was all for the principle. Well that's not quite true. I said that, first of all, any business, anybody that's got anything should find out first of all if you believe in a principle of something - this is what I said. And I said maybe we could have - answering the Honourable Member from Brokenhead - I said maybe we could have a vote only on pensions. This is all right. This is something I mean on the principle. This is something that we must decide. But that doesn't mean because you say you're for the principle that you'll let 12 people say, well I want \$2,000 a month and that you'll say well I'm for the principle of pension -- go ahead. And in the next year if they want \$5,000 a month -- well I'm for the principle of pension -- go ahead. I think I made that quite clear.

And then if he was gullible enough, Mr. Chairman, to believe that this government really meant it when they were talking about priorities for the people of Manitoba and I don't think - somebody said, I think it was, maybe it was the Minister of Welfare. I'm not sure though, but one of the Ministers said, --(Interjection)-- the First Minister? . . . . . well he's

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) . . . . . stayed here his ten minutes; this is the best I've ever been able to see him in front of me when I spoke this session, so I think that's an improvement. The Minister that brought the bill in is no longer in here either and I see that my friend the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources is going to take a powder also, so there won't be anybody else to collect a pension pretty soon. But nevertheless, we'll try to go on for the backbenchers, poor backbenchers that have had quite a battle with the members of the Cabinet in caucus this morning, so we are told, so maybe they will be interested.

Now on the question of principle - I did say this, Mr. Chairman, if you remember well - that I said the time is wrong, and that I said I knew that if we had a vote right now the principle - a vote on the principle, that it would carry because all the members of that side except you, Mr. Chairman, except the leader of the Social Credit and the members of this party - some of the members of the party, I did say this. Now I think there was only two or three that spoke about the principle, and I was one, and I said that I would be ready to discuss this but before - I wanted to discuss the principle with no strings attached and I wanted to do this with the wages. You're not going to say if somebody says well I'll pay you these wages, I'll give you \$20,000 a year well you're going to think twice - for pension.

My point that I try to make very clear although the Leader of the NDP tried to change all the meaning, trying to change everything around, I said that I wanted to have something - and I'll stick by this - I wanted to have something, an equalizer. In other words if my honourable friend was losing any money any wages because of standing here; if my honourable friend was losing because of the pension, losing his own private pension, that they should have something. Now this is what I said. But there's a lot of things besides that, and as I say it's not a blank cheque. And this is what we're asked to do today. This is what we were asked to do last Saturday, last Friday and I think it was Thursday that this was first brought in. The second last day as I said, the Lieutenant-Governor was waiting in his office to come and end the session and this bill was introduced for the second time. Can anybody say that anywhere - when I said that was this the way you do this in your own business, the minister said yes, that's the way I do it. The Minister of Welfare said yes. He doesn't even trust the labour people to have a vote. He's got to have his nose in there. He doesn't even trust them and all of a sudden he's going to vote a pension for himself.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think that this is a different thing. How can anybody tell us go ahead. . . . . and they were all mad on Saturday. They were all mad. Now look, Mr. Chairman, look at this. These are the amendments that we have now. The bill was perfect. The bill was all set to go. There it is. This is what we're given. Now I can't understand this. The Minister of Welfare -- he'll say we'll have to let that. . . . going up and down. Awhile ago when I said but we won't discuss, we won't apply it right now -- Oh yes, it had to be done right away. It had to be done right away because they can't apply for it now, most of them and because there might be an election and things won't be so safe.

I can't see - I'm going to come up now to the different reasons, the different reasons why we should have a plan. Now I think that we do have sacrifices to make. The Ministers have sacrifices to make but they also have a lot of good times and over the weekend I tried to search and find out what was all the suffering, how tough it was to be an MLA or a Minister and then I asked myself well what about the help, the compensation. Well, it's true that some people neglect their business, might neglect their business if they have a small business. That's true, when you're here you can't go on and work for your business. And it's true that a small business specially if you're working yourself you have to hire at least part-time help; so that's understandable, this is it. This is only for people employed for themselves, working for themselves. Now the others like the labour people and different groups like this, well they might lose their pension right - I believe the Leader of the NDP, I believe that when he told me this - and then you might also lose some of the wages. Well, one or the two. Then there is no doubt that you're losing - there's certain time that you can't spend with your family. Now your wife might be very pleased but it might be tough for you. Then there's also less time for recreation, although sometime just sitting here is the best entertainment, the best vaudeville we can ever get. Now there are expenses at election time, and there's also the "anxiety" of going through an election. I think that we have to agree. There's also some abuse that we get but mostly those that get abuse get some congratulation - if you just wrap yourself in cotton batten, it's all right, if you're just a rubber stamp there's not much - but if you try to speak out you get some abuse, but you get some congratulation and I think that if you're sincere you get a certain self-satisfaction that helps out. And there's also the

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd).....humiliation of defeat. Those are some of the things that are against. I recognize them. But then on the other side of the ledger: for \$4,800, that's not bad. One-third of that no taxes at all, one-third of it. \$4,800.00. \$400.00 a month. We're here - well this was the longest session in history I think - we're on, not even three months so far - it might be another month on this debate but I don't know. Then there's the Minister who is getting \$17,300 --(Interjection)-- \$500.00? No, I think it's three. Well, maybe five, what's a couple of hundred dollars in that bracket anyway. So, I don't think that's too hard to take. I'll defy any, any Minister to tell me here that he was getting more than that before he was elected here. Any one of them. And the one that can stand up I'll say, well you don't need the pension anyway. I'd like to see one of them say that he's getting -- and he's not getting it now, that he's being hurt. So I think that that's gone. I don't think you can only cry and say I'm away from my family, I'm this and that. Then there's the experience you're getting - mind you there's not too much experience on that side of the House, because this is a real fiasco, a real schmozzle this thing. Then there's different connections - and I mean that - and I will say that some of the people because of their money might lose. - and I'm thinking mostly - and there's a lot of them - in our party and all the parties - there's a lot of lawyers. There's good connections. Right away you qualify for having maybe a job as a judge. I'm not running this down. This is fine. But this is there, that exists. If you become a judge that's a pretty good reward. You might be very good. This stands there. And then I think that if you happen to be on the same side as the party in office you stand a chance that they send you some work once in a while. I know a couple here that are doing quite well, quite well - friends of the government. This is probably the way it should be. They have to give the work to somebody.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Do you think this happens?

MR. DESJARDINS: I'm told it happens --(Interjection)-- I'm told it happens. My honourable friend here from Neepawa is not too sure. He doesn't think that happens.

So then there's the question as I say of the - then there's different boards. You can always stand a chance of getting elected to a board. Some of the members are elected to it now. Some of the members are elected now on these boards. I think there's enough people outside of this House that deserve a chance, and those people would love to serve their fellow man. They would love to be on their boards, and I think that maybe we should have let those fellows be on the boards. But, anyway, this is another reward. And then there's always the Senate. There's always the Senate. I'm told, I don't know if this is somebody joking, but I'm told that the next bill of the Roblin government is to establish a provincial senate. I don't know if that's true but I'm told that this is one of the things that's coming up at the next "fruitful" session.

And then there's a certain question of prestige. I think there's prestige. I think a lot of the people think that there's prestige. I think that - well, you're supposed to be somebody, you're an elected representative and you represent a different constituency. And of course there's something that should be really rewarding, that is the satisfaction of helping your fellow man. That is some satisfaction that we could have. Now mind you with this big pension we might forget that. We might be thinking of the satisfaction of helping "this man, but this is something that I always thought should be the main reason why you could try to run for office.

And then there's a lot of trips, there's a lot of travelling. There's conventions, especially the Cabinet Ministers, there's - or if you get on the Denturists' Committee you'll have steaks in Vancouver and roast beef in Calgary - with your own teeth or with somebody else's, somebody'll loan you, I don't know. But you have these things. This helps a bit. You travel first class. This is fine. And the different invitations that you have. That helps. And if you've got a business and so on, it's not bad -- how much money would a public relation man have to spend, his expenses and so on.

And then there's a certain amount of pride - and some people, Mr. Chairman, believe it or not - I'm not looking at anybody in this House - but some people like this feel of power. They just like to be able to say "move" and you move, or "sit down" and you sit down. You see this is something that I think helps a bit. And as I say, the congratulations and so on. So these are certain things that help.

Now let us look at what type of people we have here. We have some tired ones. We have some wide-awake ones, but we have all kinds of people. It takes all kinds. Some use two chairs, others half a chair. We have farmers, ordinary people, good people. We have people from the labour force that could be the -- push him when he starts snoring. We have some people that work for either the CNR, the CPR or the Packers or any company like that. We have lawyers, professors -- yes we had two Digby Odells. One's a Minister, he was lucky he

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd), . . . . . could sell his business and the other guy's still struggling along. We have doctors - not too many. Oh my honourable friend from Municipal Affairs is worried. He says I had the business of welfare. . . . . That's the connection I was talking about, Mr. Chairman. That's the connection. I got this because I'm here. I have the privilege of burying any indigent for \$115.00. So you see the connection. They help you. They help you. Did help me. --(Interjection)-- Beg pardon? --(Interjection)-- I don't know. I don't think I'd be fortunate to have anything to do with those. . . . .

Then you have the doctors, not too many doctors. We have one. I think that probably this is one man that probably will find it tougher to go back in private life. When you're away from that, from medicine and so on for a long time, I imagine it's quite difficult. And there are people that are making fair money, the professionals - there are the doctors and the lawyers, but I don't think that the lawyers are losing anything at all, because as I say there's a lot of different reasons, different chances that they could have. Then there's insurance - people that sell insurance that are experts at insurance - and I'm certainly not. Mr. Chairman, referring to the Honourable Minister that presented this pension plan, I know he's no expert on this at all. Then there's different executives, either executive people that are working for large or small businesses. We have a minister that was a manager for a radio station. I heard he was a very good one. We have self-employed people, We have a chiropractor. The Minister of Welfare, I think he had a store. I don't know. As I say, there's teachers, there's even newspapermen we have here. We have retired people. They're not losing too much. And then we have -- I think that we can say that there's one on this side of the House and another on the other side of the House, two people that are fairly well off and they probably have two or three -- they're wheeler-dealers in other words.

So I don't think it's fair to say that there's only the rich, the big businessman that can run for office and be elected to office. I think that we've had all kinds of people. Now I don't think there's too many of them. as I say, that are making that kind of money. I don't think that there'll be too many that will have a very difficult time in going back to private life. I don't think that the farmers will have too much trouble. Mind you, they might find it a little more difficult to do a little bit of work for a change, after two months of sitting here, but I don't think that there are too many that will find it too hard, so why this great rush to put in this pension? Maybe it's because the time is right. The Minister said that we had a lot of priorities for these. I asked him where does that set a priority. "Well", he says, "it's been on the priority list for a long time. We talked about it five, ten years ago," so it's top now.

Well, I thought it would be better to reduce some of the taxes to people that want a -- the other retired people who are not fortunate enough to have spent time helping their fellow man and therefore cannot get such a good pension. If they want to go for a ride on Sunday they pay 17 cents for each gallon of gas -- that's the tax that we have. Luxury, anything is a luxury, even a man that uses his car - that's a luxury. He pays all kinds of -- the licences have gone up; the school taxes have gone up. Of course we had a fruitful session and the Department of Education decided that they would give a rebate for taxes that are going too high. Then we have sales tax and taxes on heat. So, Mr. Chairman, I can't see where we can talk about the priority, why this is the time to do this.

Now what kind of a plan? I said awhile ago that there's no point in rushing anything through, and I still say that this is a plan that is way too high. The maximum is too high; there's no reason for that at all. And then I still say that it is tailor-made for the Cabinet Ministers in front of us. I know that it's tailor-made, and they know it too. And then again we come in at the very last minute of the session - well we've covered that and I'm not going to repeat that.

Now we're not allowed to go to the -- we don't want this to go to the committee outside of the House. Well, Mr. Chairman, do we need any more -- do we need any more reason than this? This plan that was supposed to be air-tight, that was to be perfect, and look at the amendments we have. And this was from a bunch of Liberals that are only trying to play politics -- these are all things that we mentioned. We were the fellows that weren't sincere, just yelling or bombastic or all these attributes that were passed on to us, and this is it. These Ministers -- you can just imagine if you had somebody serious that really tried to work on this plan what would happen. Now there was one -- the biggest amendment - and what a change. Can anybody tell me that they didn't realize that somebody could start collecting at 36 or 28? Mr. Chairman, you know enough about . . . . . you know that if any salesman come and asked you to buy a plan -- in fact I was asking some of my friends about this pension and they said, "Well what

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) ... is it? I don't know anything about it." The first thing they want - how much do you put in? Very brief; cut and dried. This is what they want to know. How much do you put in? I told them. How much do you get? I told them. When do you start collecting? That was the third question, and this is something that's very broad - very, oh this is . . . . . scrutinize, but they didn't realize that you could collect at 26 or 27 or, well maybe 28. Now all of a sudden this goes . . . . . 50.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is enough to say, to prove that this bill has to go to a committee of people that are not interested only in feathering their own nests, and I think that this is a very important thing. Now the reason - and I think this is one of the most important things - the reason, the main reason was to attract a better class of people like we had on Friday, and nobody is anxious. My honourable friend tells me that he is going to answer my -- I asked him. The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources told us how important it was and he made a big point to say this plan of Mr. Pearson -- and then he says this is to attract better people. Do you think, Mr. Chairman, that the people of Canada, Mr. Chairman, think that there are a better class of people at Ottawa during this last session than they had before? I want somebody to answer this question because this is very important. I want to see if we're really going to achieve this, if we're going to attract a better type of people.

And now, why should this be retroactive? What's that going to do, what happened the last seven years or 10 years or 26 years? If we want a better class of people than my honourable friend from Flee Island, or something, well why should we pay him 36 times his salary, . . . . . the years he was here. If he's no good let's get rid of him, but don't pay him 36 times his salary. I don't think that that's fair. Why the question of retroactive? And if it's going to be retroactive - mind you I know that my honourable friend would take it retroactive for the Ministers that were there last year - not that are there now or when this plan comes in force. Why not for this Minister who has given more time and who's done more for this Province of Manitoba than anybody in this House? And I defy anybody to contradict me on this. I know that he wouldn't take it, but why wasn't that included? Somebody said that I was wrong when I was talking about greedy fingers? Why wasn't he included? He's in this House. Retroactive - what about the other Cabinet Ministers that are still living? What about the other MLAs? There I've got the right man there. My honourable friend, the Minister of Welfare, said that he knows two of them that were -- didn't he say they were on welfare? Why not help them? They're the ones that need it. Why not help them? No, we're supposed to believe that this is supposed to attract better men. Well why don't you help those people or to help people that have been suffering? Well there's two theories shot out the window anyway.

Now we said that we want to be sure these people are independent, so we give them great bit pensions because we want to make sure that those people can be independent. Mr. Chairman, if you're coming here, or you run, one of your main reasons -- one thing that you're satisfied, you have this certain feeling of a job well done, you've done your best. Sometimes it was hard; sometimes it was difficult but you always did your best. So you'll do this work. Well all of a sudden -- now next session, well maybe you'll run, you've been some help -- but all of a sudden you get a pension of \$588.00 a month offered to you. If you stay in a little longer \$915.00. Can anybody in his right mind tell me that you're going to be more independent? You're treating with human beings here, and what are they going to do? They're going to do anything to be elected for an extra term or another year if they just need that to be qualified. They're human beings. They want this pension. Maybe they figure they need it or not, but they want this pension. Are they going to be as strong, are they going to follow the dictates of their conscience if it's not something popular? Maybe they will, but isn't this going to tempt them a bit if there's \$588.00 every month at the end of this road or that rides maybe on one election or one decision that you make in this House. Can anybody tell me that this is going to help to be independent, to give you security?

What about the people? Is that going to give them security, the people of Manitoba? I think that this is an important thing also. Mr. Chairman, I can't repeat enough this question that it's the main thing, it should be, that we have served our fellowman well and that there should be some kind of satisfaction. If we can afford it, if we like it, if we can stay in all right, and then after that we can move along. Another thing that I think, well this has changed now. This was another pension that cost my honourable friend the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources a few dollars. But this was tailor-made also before this amendment that we brought up -- this was tailor-made to encourage more sessions - more sessions where you are going to get fully paid because that's another time you multiply your basic pay -- that's



(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) . . . another time -- that's another \$481.00 or whatever it is, more a month -- every extra pension plus the salary that you get. You saw an example even without this last year, Mr. Chairman. We had a special session. I think it was nine days; we were told that we had a surplus in the budget but we were voting taxes, new taxes. Nine days, we were paid \$200.00 a day, and three or four resolutions and bills left on the Order Paper. They died on the Order Paper. And that session cost us an election too. Some more money.

Well as I say, if this is going to be a point, and I'm saying "if this" because I would like to study this, and if I want to study the principle, I want to know the wages. I believe that there are certain sacrifices. You've got to believe there is something like this, but I think that if this is the case those are the people that should get it back, just an equalizer, just for one reason, not to give you this great security, then you lose all this merit, but to make sure that a man is not prevented from serving his fellowman because he can't afford it. Because he can't afford it. This is it. So I think that this is what you could do. Now I read this and following exactly what you yourself said, Mr. Chairman, and I agree with you, this is what I've got here and it's done in England and this is. I read that: "The House of Commons Members Fund Act" -- this is in England "in 1929, 1948 and 1957 enable periodic payments, not strictly pension, to be paid to former members of the House of Commons of at least ten years standing or to their widows" -- that's another thing we forgot, the widows and the children in here. Well what kind of a pension -- this is the main thing, those people are at home too - if you're making a sacrifice what about them? I think there should be something. If you're going to bring a pension I think this has to be taken care of. "Widows, widowers or orphans, if they are in reduced circumstances" -- if they are in reduced circumstances, and I'll go along with that. "The payments are made from funds provided solely" -- and remember this, it's very important -- "by compulsory reductions from members' parliamentary salaries and not from the public purse."

I said that maybe I would be in favour of a pension, but this is a type of pension if we pay for it ourselves -- if we pay for it ourselves. I think that this is an important thing to remember. I think that if we -- if anybody wants to follow this type, if we get somebody to bring in exactly to agree with you on this, let's provide for the widows and the children and do something like this, just for the people that need it. Just for the people that need it. It was so beautiful before and, as I said, this has been changed -- and again another motion. But we had it, if you remember, Mr. Chairman, we can have a man running, qualifying for a Cabinet Minister pension. And then he comes and sits here. He'd start collecting that pension. The next year he'd go to Ottawa, maybe and maybe he'd be a Cabinet Minister there. He could even be the Prime Minister of Canada and he'd collect the pension that he earned here. And this was the plan that my honourable friend says was so well prepared. And then when he was fed up with that or when he had done so much of this work in this great satisfaction to work for his fellowman he'd get out of there and get a pension from there. Or he'd go to the Senate. He means to tell me that they can look at it seriously. Somebody said about shaving and looking at himself in the mirror - oh, the Minister said this this afternoon. Can they do this and say that this is fair? I challenge him to do that. I challenge him to do that when there are some people that are waiting in line that you have to have a means test before you collect your pension. You have to be 70 years old and we were ready to give a pension to a man, to a boy 29 years old. This is what we were ready to do. People have to work till they're 70 years old. Let them not declare something; let them not declare something, Mr. Chairman. What happens? If they get a little more, if their husband works extra a little bit and they got some welfare and then the man dies, you know what happens, the widow she pays back, she pays back \$10.00 a month from her \$75.00 because she received too much money, because she was overpaid, overpaid, when she's 70 and she's alone and she's a widow. She was overpaid so she has to pay \$10.00 back a month. Now can anybody tell me that - that this is fair, that this is a good plan?

MR. CARROLL: . . . . . question at this point?

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes, I'll permit a question.

MR. CARROLL: Who makes those regulations that require that money to be paid back?

MR. DESJARDINS: Who makes those regulations?

MR. CARROLL: Yes, who does?

MR. DESJARDINS: You'll tell me it's Ottawa.

MR. CARROLL: Yes it is.

MR. DESJARDINS: All right. So that makes it any different. The widow doesn't know if it's Ottawa or Mayor Juba . . . . . Lower Slobodia . . . . . that she will pay that \$10.00 back.

MR. CARROLL: . . . . . permit another question?

MR. DESJARDINS: Three more if you want.

MR. CARROLL: And if she doesn't get quite enough money after she pays that money back, who meets her need?

MR. DESJARDINS: Who is it?

MR. CARROLL: It's the Province of Manitoba under The Social Allowances Act.

MR. DESJARDINS: And would you permit a question?

MR. CARROLL: Yes.

MR. DESJARDINS: Who is the Province of Manitoba? Who's the Province of Manitoba? The people of Manitoba that you want to hoodwink, that you want to I say put those little fingers on that pension of \$588.00 or so. Those are the people that pay her what? What do they pay her? Would you like to tell me now what's she allowed? Would you give me that chart now? I'm not -- I'm not knocking this welfare. I know that this is tax money. But look at what you're giving yourself? Do you want to stand up there and you want to tell me she gets \$30.00 for food, \$2.50 for medicine or something, and then on top of that we put a five percent tax on heat, on fuel. Do you want to tell me that? I'll gladly have a debate with you on this and see who comes out best. The man that is working here for \$17,500 that until yesterday could go to Ottawa for maybe \$5,000 and still while he's there collect \$588.00. or the woman that's fortunate enough to get from the Department of Welfare of this city of this province 10 or 15 dollars. I'd like to know who's the luckiest one. I was just enjoying this. Mr. Chairman, but I'm told there's other members that are just dying to speak, so I'll have to wait a little longer.

. . . . . continued on next page.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Chairman, I listened with interest to the lecture the Honourable Minister gave us tonight on all the good things that he and his group have done for Manitoba. You'd think he'd learned a lesson with the shambles his bill had turned into that he would go easy on lecturing people, but no, he gets up here, then he starts lecturing us, lecturing us on our conduct, and at the same time he's trying to explain the shambles that is in front of us. I'm surprised. I might ask the Honourable Minister when is the next amendment coming in? We would like to study them a little bit. The last one came in at 8:20.

Mr. Chairman, the cabinet members of this government have finally been unmasked for what they are, for what they are, a group of grasping individuals out to line their own pockets at taxpayers' expense. Now why do I make this statement? Because they've proved it themselves with this bunch of amendments they brought in, and while I'm at it I'll put the Leader of the NDP right alongside of them. He stood up and defended them, said this was fine, this was a great pension plan, don't knock it, let's have the vote, let's get it through. And I say to the people of Manitoba, there's the cabinet that's running your affairs and what have they tried to do? In the last day or two of the session they try to sneak a bill through. When I asked the Minister who was putting the bill forward at first reading, I asked him about a clause in the bill. So what was his answer? His answer was, "read it, read the bill, read the bill." Well I would like to know, Mr. Chairman, how we are to wade through this legalese that is in this big mass of amendments to find out what the meanings are behind some of them. And later on I'm going to come to some of that.

I say that they're still at it in this bill even yet trying to pull something, trying to hoodwink the people of Manitoba. This in a province where the minimum wage is what, 75 cents an hour? The minimum wage here? There's thousands of people working in Manitoba for 30 and 40 and 50 dollars a week. I have here an urban school newsletter that makes some salary comparisons, and this salary comparison is only made on people in Winnipeg with other cities who are steadily employed. It doesn't include people who are unemployed, it doesn't include people who are on pensions, it doesn't include people who have part-time employment, it only includes the permanently employed persons. And I would like to give some of these figures to the committee. "In comparing salaries paid to any particular group of people in the country, it is relevant to consider the salaries of other people in the communities concerned. This gives an indication of the taxpayers' ability to provide the required funds and it also has some bearing on the cost of living, recognizing what one might call 'keeping up with the Jones', plus the higher costs of services where wages are higher. The latest Bureau of Statistics figures on average weekly wages and salaries for a few cities across Canada are of interest in this regard." And here are the figures: "Halifax, the average weekly wage is \$73.32 a week; Quebec, \$76.19 a week; Montreal, \$87.52 a week; Toronto, \$91.68 a week; Winnipeg, \$77.07; Regina, \$80.97 a week; Calgary, \$86.97 a week; Vancouver, \$93.94 a week. These figures represent the average weekly wages and salaries of people while working. Those who are temporarily unemployed are not considered in calculating weekly wages, so you do not get an average figure if you multiply by 52." Now we were asked to consider making pensions available to the cabinet. I'm talking about now. Their lowest one, \$314 a month, more or less - - I believe it just comes under one of these wages; the Winnipeg wage works out to something like \$4,000 a year, so that the minimum cabinet minister retirement salary would be \$314 a month. Then the next step up is \$588 a month and then of course it goes all the way up to over \$900 a month.

Just an aside, but the Honourable Member for Brandon said that there were some extravagant claims made Saturday night. I was getting up to ask the question of the honourable member to enumerate some of the extravagant claims that we had made but I was not allowed to put my question. I would still like the Member from Brandon to tell our group what the extravagant claims were that we were making.

MR. LISSAMAN: Now?

MR. JOHNSTON: You'll have your turn, we've got lots of time.

MR. LISSAMAN: You wanted me to tell you.

MR. JOHNSTON: Do you want to make it now?

MR. LISSAMAN: Sure.

MR. JOHNSTON: Okay.

MR. LISSAMAN: I can certainly tell you what extravagant claims you're making. I felt when I appealed to the members of that party Saturday night for a little commonsense viewpoint of this that they might listen to some reason. All their claims, or the vast majority of their

(MR. LISSAMAN cont'd) . . . . claims on this scheme have been based upon when a person would be in this House the maximum term to get 70 percent, which would take over 21 years of office, and I pointed out that time since I've come in the House, if you go back over the last 13, 14 years you will find that there are only eight members here that were here then, so that the chances of so many getting these tremendous pensions you're speaking of, chances are extremely few. And I would ask you that, supposing we do take one or two extreme cases. It's very rare that a man like the Honourable Member for Lakeside comes along who merits and enjoys public opinion -- (Interjection) -- all his lifetime.

MR. JOHNSTON: I asked for the extravagant claims, not . . . .

MR. LISSAMAN: You asked me to explain and you're getting it.

MR. JOHNSTON: I didn't ask for an explanation. I asked for the extravagant claims.

MR. LISSAMAN: Oh yes, you did. You asked for an explanation.

Mr. Chairman, who has the floor -- the member that asked me or the member that wants to now butt in?

So let's look at the rare case of a man like the Member for Lakeside who can enjoy this popular support and the people appreciate the service he has given. First of all, the man in the cabinet is one out of 13 and those 13 are out of one million population of this province. Let's take a look at the types of jobs that would be available to men of that calibre if they reach that peak position that there are only 13 available out of a million. And let's suppose he gave 21 years in private industry of his lifetime, certainly the most productive years, in fact a whole working lifetime. And would you consider that this pension that's available at that time as proposed in this scheme unreasonable? I would suggest that in that kind of a selection to that kind of a job he would be getting a very much higher pension, and long before he got there he would be getting salaries much higher than are paid over here in this front bench.

So this is why I appealed to a little commonsense approach to this Saturday night, and I had hoped members would start to look at the average case instead of these unreasonable cases that you're citing, and I'm quite willing to face those unreasonable cases because they'll come along so seldom, I can certainly realize that through my short lifetime in this House that I have seen many come and go having only been elected four years, one term, and I would guess that as soon as a man starts to be elected to more than two full-time sessions, normal terms of office, he's started to fall into rather a rare bird class, so that I think that when you keep emphasizing what the extreme capability of this pension might be you're completely unrealistic I suggested Saturday night and if you want me to repeat everything that I said, and I suspect you weren't listening or you wouldn't have asked for an explanation, that the parallel you might refer to is a motor car. Any one of our cars will do a hundred miles an hour, but there are speed limits, and here we have an actual limit imposed upon the livelihood or the chance of a man attaining that maximum pension, and so I think that when you deal only in extremes, emphasize these tremendous pensions, they're ridiculous, particularly when you look -- that out of a million population at any one given time there are only going to be 13 men probably that will qualify.

MR. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Perhaps the Honourable Member from Brandon would not take exception if I were to say it this way, that the cabinet minister's pension plan ranges from \$314 a month to over \$900 a month. Somewhere in there, \$314 is the minimum and over \$900 a month is the maximum. So if there's anything extravagant in talking about these figures, I fail to see it. -- (Interjection) -- I don't think anybody's been unduly emphasizing the top ones, but it's there. It's there.

MR. LISSAMAN: Well I'm glad it's there because I think that kind of a man will deserve it.

MR. JOHNSTON: Well when the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources was making his glowing contribution to this debate a few days ago, he made much out of the niggling and quibbling over members on our side taking objection to the pension plan as it was before us at that time. Surely he must realize by now that the amendments that have been brought in so far have saved the taxpayers of Manitoba hundreds of thousands of dollars. I'm sure he'll agree with that. Too bad that a lot of the saving was made at his expense, but that again is unfortunate. I also recall some of the honourable members opposite, and to the other party on my left, they had a lot to say about the Canadian Pension Plan, about which draft -- the revised draft, the first draft, the second draft, and so on. Well Mr. Chairman, we are now on our what -- third or fourth set of amendments so far in this bill, so perhaps it would not be an unfair question to ask, which draft of the cabinet ministers' pension plan are we on now? So far we've

(MR. JOHNSTON cont'd) . . . . had at least three amendments, all major -- major amendments.

Mr. Chairman, during the weekend, I had an opportunity to get a few pamphlets on various pension plans and, while I'm certainly not going to read everything in these as perhaps that may strain your patience, I would like to refer to certain sections I have here. It's put out by a well-known life insurance company and strangely enough the wording on the cover says, "Let's Raise a Storm." Of course they didn't particularly like the idea of the pension plan and they had some things to say about it. But on the very last page the gentleman speaking said, and I will quote; "So let us just once be militant. It will be profoundly important democratic exercise to prove whether pet schemes can in fact be imposed on the Canadian people without public examination and approval." Now that's an interesting statement -- "without public examination and approval. Can we effectively demand restraint? If a few thousand people across this country use their imagination, their enthusiasm, and their honest indignation we will soon find out." Well I would suggest Mr. Chairman, that there's a few thousand people across Manitoba who are getting a little bit indignant about the plan that's before us.

"We have three short weeks in which we either can or cannot succeed in having Parliament stop, look and listen before this die is cast. It is my conviction that our success or failure will permanently affect the future course of this country." At least this gentleman when he's speaking, he had three weeks to do some considering. Here, if the ministers would have had their way, we would have had two days to do some considering.

Well, Mr. Chairman, our motion asks that this bill be sent to a committee for scrutiny. If it will stand the light of day this is what the committee is for. It seems that my honourable friends across the way, although they have not given any indication of supporting our motion, if they were honest in their hearts, they would let this go to the committee and stand some scrutiny, and I'd be very interested if they'd give some indication as to whether they will or not.

Now if I may refer now to a brochure, I believe it's a guidance sheet put out by the Department of Welfare for the information of members. I presume when they're dealing with people who would be asking questions. And it's a fairly straight-forward set of rules and regulations. There's eight requirements, residential requirements, income requirements, there are ceilings on any incomes -- and I would suggest that this . . . .

MR. CARROLL: Would the honourable member permit a question at this point?

MR. JOHNSTON: Sure.

MR. CARROLL: You weren't in your seat a few minutes ago when the Member for St. Boniface referred to the means test, and I think you are now referring to the means test again which is imposed by the Government of Canada, not by the Government of Manitoba. It's on the categorical program for old age assistance, blind persons' allowances and disability pensions. We must abide by their regulations because they make all the rules with respect to those programs, and where people are still in need beyond those programs we cover them under The Social Allowances Act. This might help to inform you about the statements which you are about to make.

MR. JOHNSTON: Thank you very much. I don't know quite what the point was but thanks anyway. Now it says in the first paragraph, "The provincial welfare department through the provincial allowances board administers three important programs to provide assistance to elderly persons 65 to 69 years of age, to persons who are blind, and to persons who are disabled." Then as I said, Mr. Chairman, it goes on into the requirements. For old age assistance, "must be 65 years and under 70, with documentary proof of age." That's one thing that is not needed in this plan -- "and month of birth. Applicants who are unable to secure birth or baptismal certificates may use any other records such as marriage certificates, insurance policies, army discharge papers, school and family . . . ."

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . . before this committee.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I'm trying to make the point that in our proposed bill here there are no such qualifications whatsoever. Does this mean that a cabinet minister or someone who retires says, I'm 55 years old, please send my pension? I'm not suggesting that anybody would be misrepresenting their age, but there's nothing in the bill saying that it is required to produce documentary proof. This is one of the points I am making about the bill. "Residents" -- well that hardly need to enter into it.

"Income." Here is an interesting requirement. "Total annual income from all sources includes real property, real estate, . . . ."

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . . for Portage la Prairie, you must speak to the motion and not go on like are . . . .

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I'm giving my reasons as to why this should go to a committee because there's so many things lacking in this bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Those are covered by regulations and there's provision in this bill for regulations.

MR. JOHNSTON: All right, Mr. Chairman. But surely there should be some sort of an income ceiling that's more acceptable than 10,900 a year pension. Surely this point should be considered, that a person when he reaches 55 years of age can subsist most comfortably on a considerably less sum of money than 10,000.

However, I'd like to refer directly to one of the sets of amendments. I think it's the second last one, the second last set of amendments. And on Page 3, there's a section that has now -- and I might say it would take a Philadelphia lawyer to figure out these amendments, and in the supper hour interval some of us did try to get into the meat of it a little bit, but however the Minister had told us before to not look for an explanation, just read it, so we'll do the best we can.

Now, I see it takes a very hard rap at lawyers and I think this is almost discrimination. If they're appointed a judge or some judicial or semi-judicial appointment, that means that their pension is held in abeyance. I understand that much. But the next section is rather intriguing. This is now, Page 3, the 15th motion, clause (b) and I quote, and we're talking about members or ministers I believe -- anyway it says -- this is when the pension will not be paid -- "When a Member becomes a member of the Senate or the House of Commons of Canada or the Legislature of any other Province of Canada." Now, Mr. Chairman, this clause makes me rather suspicious, rather suspicious, when I recall a few weeks ago there was quite a debate went on over the definition of the word "upon", and the government went to the great trouble to pass legislation in this particular case to make "upon" mean one year, which is a rather strange definition of "upon doing something", but for governmental purposes and this government, that becomes one year. Now in this clause here, it says -- and I repeat again -- "becomes a member of the Senate or of the House of Commons of Canada or of the Legislature of any other Province of Canada". Does that mean that a minister can either be fired, demoted and go to the backbench, or his party can be defeated and he return as a private member, does that mean that he can start drawing his pension and sit and draw an indemnity as well in Manitoba? Because it certainly doesn't include Manitoba in this, and if you're going to exclude a member from sitting in all these other jurisdictions, why not make it apply to Manitoba as well. -- (Interjection) -- Well maybe I haven't got that amendment. What section, Mr. Chairman? Is it in the bill, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: In the amendment.

MR. JOHNSTON: Not in the amendments I have. I only have three sets of amendments. I'd be very interested, Mr. Chairman, if he could point that out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The new motion No. 10 covers that.

MR. JOHNSTON: Beg your pardon?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The new motion No. 10. That was distributed tonight.

MR. JOHNSTON: What line, Mr. Chairman? In the (b) section of the new motion it says, "a member of the Senate or of the House of Commons of Canada, or the Legislature of any other Province of Canada."

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's covered by the new motion No. 10 that was distributed tonight.

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't read that. Perhaps I'm wrong but in clause (c) they will refuse the pension to anyone that is employed full-time -- "in full-time employment by the Government of Canada, the Government of Manitoba or the government of any other province of Canada." But this clause, of any other province of Canada, does this include Manitoba or does it not? I ask the minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . . in the new motion No. 10.

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, I'd certainly take the minister's word for it, but I can't get that meaning out of the amendment.

Now there's another item; I just bring it up as another reason why this should go to a committee for its study, for a searching scrutiny. There's been an amendment that changes the eight sessions to ten years, but what about the next stage of the pension? The ten-year clause affects the initial pension of \$314 a month. So, does the 15 sessions still hold, or else the number of sessions, still hold to qualify for the \$588 a month? The minimum pension has been

(MR. JOHNSTON cont'd) . . . . changed to have ten years to qualify, but after that it reverts to sessions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, no there's no more reference to sessions.

MR. JOHNSTON: Oh, Well, Mr. Chairman, I for one would certainly like to see this bill go to a committee for a little scrutiny by people who are qualified in the field. I did a little research today and asked some questions of a life insurance company of how one would go about providing a pension. To provide a pension of \$314 per month, starting at the age 30, and if the person were to draw the pension at age 40, which is a ten-year period of paying into the fund, then at age 40 he starts drawing \$314 a month, how much would that person have to pay? According to my figures here that I have received, this person would have to pay \$62,046 over the ten-year period to have a \$314 pension at the end of ten years. In other words, perhaps we could recommend to the citizens of Manitoba that if they wished to start up a like pension plan, all they'd have to do is put away \$500 a month for ten years and at the age 40 they can be on the same scale as the lowest scale of the cabinet ministers. At age 35 a single premium, this means if the person were to put all the money in at once, in order to get a \$10 unit . . . Pardon?

MR. STEINKOPF: Would you answer a question?

MR. JOHNSTON: Certainly.

MR. STEINKOPF: Is the pension at 40, the figure that you've just given, one for life or for a period of 12 years.

MR. JOHNSTON: That's for life, Mr. Chairman.

MR. STEINKOPF: For life.

MR. JOHNSTON: When I made my research there were a number of amendments hadn't been in.

MR. STEINKOPF: Oh, I thought you said you made the inquiries today. I was just wondering.

MR. JOHNSTON: I did. I made them before the amendment was . . . .

MR. STEINKOPF: That amendment was made a few days ago.

MR. JOHNSTON: So, in order to buy a pension with a lump sum at age 35, -- a single premium of a lump sum of money -- in order to get a \$10 pension for life the person would have to put up \$2,096 to get the \$10 unit. Now of course this can be extended on into the other figures that we have had before us, the proposed pensions. Age 42, a single premium for an immediate annuity, one would have to pay in \$1,922 to get \$10 coming for the rest of their lives. Age 45, a single premium would have to be paid of \$1,837 to bring in a \$10 pension for life. At age 50, one would have to put up in hard cash \$1,691 in order to provide a \$10 unit of pension. Now, Mr. Chairman, I am really sorry that I haven't got age 55 here. I haven't got age 55. We were just before -- the bell was ringing and we had to get back and I would certainly be interested to know, but it would appear to be somewhere around fourteen, fifteen hundred dollars that one would have to put up to get a \$10 unit of pension at age 55.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I don't know if we are expected to vote on this thing tonight or not but surely, surely after the shambles that has been put before us, after the mass of amendments, mostly major in nature, this is ample evidence that this plan still needs a lot of looking at, and I support my leader when I say I have had reservations about the whole business from start to finish, of whether a province like Manitoba can put out a plan of this nature at all, and I certainly hope it goes to a committee for study.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Before we proceed any further in this debate, I as a member of this House who could take direct immediate advantage of this plan if the bill is passed, would like to have a ruling from you or from Madam Speaker on what interpretation to place on Rule 12 of Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceedings of the Manitoba Legislative Assembly.

Now, on looking around the House I think there are 11 members in this House just now who, in my opinion at least, have a direct pecuniary benefit in this legislation, and what I would like to know is, by reason of the fact that these 11 members have that direct pecuniary benefit or interest in this legislation, whether or no they are precluded under Rule 12 from taking part in this debate or voting on the motion. Now the rule reads: "(12) A member shall not vote upon any question in which he has a direct pecuniary interest and the votes of any members so interested shall be disallowed." Now I think that's quite clear. Now I know that members will argue that under The Legislative Assembly Act we do vote on our indemnity. That is perfectly true. We do. But that is a specific provision in The Legislative Assembly Act and what we were doing then when we vote on that is amending that particular section. But here,

(MR. HILLHOUSE cont'd) . . . . if this bill becomes law, we are enacting new legislation which is not provided specifically in The Legislative Assembly Act, but simply provided under the general jurisdiction which this House has over property and civil rights. Now I think we should know before we proceed any further what our position is legally in this matter.

I would like to support my leader too, Mr. Chairman, on the suggestion that this matter be given further study. The Honourable Minister tonight when, he spoke on the two new batches of amendments which he submitted to us, stated that these amendments were as a result of some good suggestions that came from this side of the House. Now I thank the Honourable Minister for showing his appreciation on the suggestions given to him and I believe that we have a number of other good suggestions which we could make but we are fearful of making them in case it would result in another batch of amendments being submitted to the committee for further consideration. I suggest Mr. Chairman, if that is the situation which we find ourselves in, isn't it only logical to conclude that if this matter were placed before a committee, at which interested citizens could appear and state their views in respect to these particular matters, that we would get many more valuable suggestions from them because these suggestions would not be made in the heat of debate. These suggestions would be made as a result of thought and study. Not that I'm suggesting that there isn't thought and study goes into debate. There is. But there would be more thought, there'd be more consideration and more study made if citizens were allowed to appear before that committee and state their views, and I would strenuously urge, Mr. Chairman, that the government give consideration and serious consideration to that suggestion. If the government is not prepared to give consideration to that suggestion, then I suggest that the government allow us an opportunity of studying the amendments which have been placed on our desks today, because we have not yet had an opportunity of so studying, and I for one would like to have an opportunity of reading these amendments as against the bill as originally drafted so that I can be in a position to know their full import and intent.

I think the fact that there has been some discussion by other members in this House as to what these amendments mean, is a clear indication that more time should be given for the study of these amendments, and I don't think that I'm asking something which is not fair. I think I'm asking for something which I consider to be reasonable and I consider to be just, and I would ask that further time be given to the members of the Opposition to study the amendments that have been placed on our desks tonight.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I think it's a very interesting one, and you may have noted, Mr. Chairman, that I haven't taken part in the debate or in the amendments that have been proposed by the Honourable the Provincial Secretary in this matter recently, and the reason is because of the fact that I had too some concern as to how Section 12 of our rules applied to myself, because Mr. Chairman if the amendments are adopted and I'm one of ten members in this House that may be affected. However, I think certain precedents have been established in this House as to members taking part in debate when they are interested in pecuniary gain. I think, as the Honourable Member for Selkirk has quite properly pointed out, that every time we pass the estimates dealing with the amount of appropriation for members that maybe we're in violation of Rule No. 12. I also recall that a year or so ago, after we had adopted in the estimates of the department concerned with emolument to members, that the subsequent year after the emolument for the Leader of the Opposition had been increased from \$3,500 to \$6,000 that the Leader of the Opposition stood up and raised the question as to why he had not received by virtue of a cheque the new allowance that was allocated after we had dealt with the estimates the year previous. I'm sure that Members of the House will recall this. Now, I'm not raising this, I'm not raising this . . . .

MR. MOLGAT: On a point of order, I don't believe that I raised the matter, Mr. Chairman.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition did and then he was supported by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, and I'm sure if my friend will refer to a Hansard of that year he will confirm or have verified that he did raise this matter and if I recall correctly the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer at that particular time said that he would take it under advisement and take the matter up with the Comptroller-General, and subsequently made a report to the House that it was due to some technicality insofar as rules of procedure in the Treasury Department was concerned.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I regret that I do not agree with that statement at all. It was the Member for Lakeside who raised it, not myself.



MR. PAULLEY: Yes, the Member for Lakeside also came into the picture Mr. Chairman, but I say to the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition that if he gets back to Hansard he will find that, whether the Honourable Member for Lakeside first raised it or not, the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose did enter into the discussion at some time or other.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, that's a very different point from that the Leader of the NDP was making. I was asked whether or not it was true that I had received it or not. I did not enter -- in fact I said quite clearly at that time that I was highly embarrassed by the discussion and merely made the point as to what the situation was. I did not raise the matter.

MR. PAULLEY: I can understand the embarrassment of my honourable friend Mr. Chairman, but nonetheless whether I am right in recalling this or not, it still is, it still is, a fact that we members of this House do deal with matters with which we have a pecuniary interest and on the point of order raised by the Honourable Member for Selkirk, we do have, we do have, every time that we have to consider whether or not we're going to have an increase or transversely a reduction in the indemnities which is going to be paid to the members of this House. Similarly, as suggested the other day Mr. Chairman, this is the matter which is before us today. It's within the confines of we members of this Assembly to consider that, and I would suggest on the point of order, Mr. Chairman, that the rule basically that was referred to by the Honourable Member for Selkirk is apart from the subject matter that is under consideration by this Assembly at the present time. I think that in general on the point of order Mr. Chairman, that Rule 12 deals with anything other than our indemnities or any other emolument that we might receive as the result of being members of this House. I think it deals with something outside of this House. Now I'm not sure of this. I'm not sure of this, and maybe Mr. Chairman, that you should take this under your consideration. Maybe you should refer this to Madam Speaker, on the point of order, quite properly raised by the Honourable the Member for Selkirk. But I would like to suggest this Mr. Chairman, that if the point raised by my friend from Selkirk, -- and I'm sure I can call him friend -- from Selkirk, then the question of indemnities or any other matter insofar as monetary return is concerned, is beyond the jurisdiction of we members of this Legislature.

And may I suggest that this would also apply to the resolutions which have already passed in the House so far as the sitting of committees are concerned, whereby provisions are made on approval of the -- who would it be -- Treasury Board, the Comptroller-General, that out-of-pocket expenses may be paid to the members of the various committees. I say this, Mr. Chairman, really only that it appears to me, rightly or wrongly, that there is provision either in The Assembly Act or some other Act where Rule 12 has a different connotation than that suggested by my honourable friend the Member for Selkirk. It might be Mr. Chairman, that he's perfectly correct, but it does seem -- (Interjection) -- Yes, yes, my honourable friend says, he's only raising the question, he wants a ruling -- I haven't been in the House as you well know Mr. Chairman, as long as my honourable friend the Member for Selkirk but I do know that I have approved of resolutions which pays me a certain sum of money for out-of-pocket expenses, although I'm really deprived of them because I live in the orbit of the Greater Winnipeg area -- (Interjection) -- No, you don't get them either. But it pays me an indemnity for each year that we sit here or special sessions. It's a very interesting point and I do say to my honourable friend from Selkirk that he has raised a very valid point and a very interesting one which might be the subject of investigation, Mr. Chairman, by yourself or Madam Speaker, but whether or not precedence is the rule in this to substantiate the question that is before us, I don't know. It could be that ever since Manitoba became a province back in 1870 that every member of the Legislature could be called to the bar to answer for his negligence or his crookedness -- no matter what you call it -- as having received an indemnity from the Province of Manitoba because in our estimates, ever since we became a province members of this House have been voting an indemnity unto themselves.

So it's a very interesting proposition and I, unlike my friend the Honourable Member for Selkirk am not a constitutional lawyer, but it does raise an interesting proposition and I suggest maybe you should take it under advisement and if perchance the humble member for Radisson, since he's been in here for 12 or 13 years has received some emolument or indemnity for which he wasn't properly entitled to, then I would suggest to the Honourable the Attorney-General or the Comptroller-General or somebody else, please, please prosecute me. Maybe my wife would be a darn sight better off if I was behind the bars at Headingley or at Stony Mountain than before the Bar in this Assembly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . the honourable member could very well be prosecuted because

(MR. CHAIRMAN cont'd) . . . . under the Section 58, subsection 2 of The Legislative Assembly Act, there's provision for payment of an indemnity in respect of attendance and an allowance for expenses incident to the discharge of his duties as a member; such amount shall not exceed half of the amount payable under paragraph (a) . . . .

MR. FAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, you've relieved my mind and when we rise tonight now I can go home and say to my dear wife, "Mary, Russ hasn't been in error all these years" and I might be able to sleep comfortably. Thank you kindly.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Chairman . . . . the question I've raised regarding this particular debate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Perhaps someone else has something to say with reference to this point of order. -- (Interjection) -- If you're speaking to the point of order.

MR. MORRIS GRAY (Inkster): I may be one of the 11 that the honourable member from Selkirk had in mind. I can assure him that I have no intention to apply for this privilege, not at least until my term in this House expires. So he'll sleep better tonight.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I have already spoken once in this debate but since other members are taking advantage of a second time and a third time probably in some cases, I thought I should make a few more comments and also probably ask for some verification in connection with one item.

I still feel the same way. I think this matter could be referred to a committee because there is no rush to it and then bring the bill back next year and have it considered by the committee as a whole and sure enough at that time we wouldn't have to deal with as many amendments as we are dealing in connection with this particular bill. And I think the members are getting paid so that they won't suffer too much in the meantime.

I had occasion to visit the North Dakota House this year in February, just prior to the opening of our Manitoba Legislature and I found it very interesting. I had a one-day visit out there and was introduced to both Chambers and the House of Representatives which had a membership of 113 and also to the other House where they have 49 Senators and they had a terrific amount of work to be done. They had 460 bills introduced into both Houses which had to be dealt with first in one House and then they were exchanged and dealt with in the other House. And all this work was supposed to be done in 60 days. Apparently that's the number of sitting days that they have. And their indemnity is much much smaller than ours. They get \$5.00 a day plus \$20.00 expenses and apparently this \$5.00 indemnity that cannot be changed unless they have a referendum and they've put this to the people of North Dakota on I think two previous occasions and it was turned down every time. So they're unable to change the \$5.00 a day stipulation. Naturally they can increase the \$20.00 expense allowance and apparently they have increased it to the \$20.00 so they have had a little increase. But just think of it, this amounts to \$1,200 compared to what we are getting, although we are sitting longer I think. But they work long hours. The day I was there, they worked till after midnight and in order to get the amount of bills through the House that they have -- and I mentioned the number, 460 -- and this is a terrific amount of work. Then I was also interested in the procedure that they followed. They set up committees and the estimates apparently are worked through committees and then brought in by way of reports by the committees and are dealt with in that fashion. Maybe that would be a time-saver as far as Manitoba is concerned if we did it in that way. There was a few other things I was going to mention. . . . .

MR. CAMPBELL: . . . . . my honourable friend, but might I ask him one question? Is my honourable friend aware whether or no they have a pension in that State?

MR. FROESE: . . . . . my knowledge, I didn't expect the pension bill to come forward in Manitoba, so I never put the question to the Senator that I was with that day and by the way the Senator that was with me that day was Senator Grant Chan. . . . . who is on a wheelchair; he's a cripple and he does his work and he's very well respected in the North Dakota Chamber. So I thought I'd just let the members of the committee know these few things that might be of interest and just give a little change in the subject. But I'm afraid though if this bill was put to a vote to the people of Manitoba, I think it would have the same fate as the matter in North Dakota that they would be turning it down. What I can't figure out is how this bill in the initial stage first got by the government caucus. I don't know how their caucus operates but I'm sure in my own caucus that if the matter is in doubt we all agree that it's doubtful and if we're sure we are sure that it passes. But I don't think it was too well considered otherwise we wouldn't have had the number of amendments that we have before us at the present time. And I think for that very reason it should be referred back.

(MR. FROESE cont'd).....

Now the Honourable Member for Portage drew one point and I'm not too clear, and this is what I would like to have clarification on. On the last amendment that was handed out tonight referring to Section 22 of the bill, it says in sub-clause (b) -- and this deals with the discontinuance of allowance while they're judges or so on, and it says in clause (b) -- "where he is a member of the Senate or the House of Commons of Canada or of the Legislature of any other Province of Canada." This seems to me to exclude Manitoba, so that in Manitoba you could still be a sitting member and also draw the pension. I'd like to be corrected if I am not drawing the right conclusions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ..... the motion No. 10 which is on the same sheet that you have just read from. That has the effect of excluding Manitoba members too.

MR. FROESE: Oh, I didn't check that part of it so I'll give that a further check to satisfy myself. I had a few other thoughts that I was going to express but I think that will suffice for the time being. I would like to see this House prorogue that we could leave and do some more worthwhile work. I think we have reason that this should not continue on indefinitely. I for one at least would like to see this brought to a conclusion. I don't think we're gaining anything but as I said, I think this bill could well be referred to the committee that the motion asks for, and let them come back with the report next year and then let's deal with it. I don't think anyone is going to be hurt by it and this would further the matter I think.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): ..... ask my honourable friend a question. That just took this seat, because I found it very interesting, the remarks that he made about the North Dakota Legislature. I wondered if it was really noticeable the quality of the members in this House compared to the quality of the ones down there because this is really, according to my honourable friends opposite, the main point. The main point in bringing this pension in is to encourage better men. Now I want to ask him point blank because he knows -- he knows, if he's observed it down there, would you say that the men opposite in particular, are really superior to the men, and outshine them in every aspect, to the ones in North Dakota? I wonder if I could have an answer to that.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I don't think I have an answer for that. I was only there for a day. I couldn't answer that truthfully.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, there was a point of order raised a few moments ago by my colleague the Member for Selkirk, which I think is very valid, and which requires an answer. The Leader of the NDP proceeded into the discussion and took an opportunity to say that I had requested last year--(Interjection)--no, no, just a minute, you started off by saying that I had requested, that I had been the leader in bringing up the matter and I had requested it. When I objected and he insisted that this was so, referred me to Hansard. Well I objected again, and he said, well maybe the Member for Lakeside was first but you came in after. I have Hansard, Mr. Chairman, and I do not enter the discussion at any stage. This is on Page 232 of Hansard, dated Wednesday, February 19th, 1964, department 1, resolution 1 is called by the Chairman. The next heading is Mr. Campbell, then Mr. Roblin, Mr. Campbell, Mr. Roblin, Mr. Campbell, Mr. Roblin, Mr. Campbell, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Roblin, Mr. Campbell, Mr. Roblin, Mr. Campbell, Mr. Roblin, Mr. Campbell, Mr. Cherniack, Mr. Paulley, Mr. Roblin, and on and on and you can go through the whole affair until the passing of that particular item which I think is on Page 236, and my name does not appear a single time, and as a matter of fact during the rest of that particular discussion, my name does not appear in Hansard and the House rises on Page 242--(Interjection)--1964, February 19th. So I would ask the Leader of the NDP that when he makes statements of that type that he have his facts correct.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, on this point raised by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, I accept what he has stated from Hansard in respect of the year 1964, but I believe that the alteration was made in 1962 or 1963. When I was speaking a moment ago, I said either last year or the year before. Now my Honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition has dug out Hansard of 1964. I accept what he has said in respect of 1964. However, whether it was '64 or '63, and whether my memory serves me correctly or not, I want to ask my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition this question because we're dealing with the question of members voting for or taking part, and certainly by voting for, you must be taking part in receiving an indemnity or an emolument as the result of being a member of this Assembly. I want to ask my honourable friend, and I accept his position in respect of last year, whether he absolved himself from voting for the extra emolument that he receives as Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I would have to check Hansard as to exactly what I did in that. Of course I frankly must admit that I do not recall. I would presume that what I did was the same thing as the other members did when the indemnities were voted because the change came through at the same time and I presume the rest of the members sat in the House at the same time as I sat. The point that my honourable friend was making was that I had entered the debate and requested this and this is not so. I did enter the debate some days after when the First Minister came back and announced that the payment would be made and I then said that this was an embarrassment to me, that I appreciated what had been done and I thanked him for it. But I did not request it and I did not enter the debate.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . . . friend for his last remarks, Mr. Chairman. He said by his own words right now it was an embarrassment to him but he thanked the Honourable the First Minister for in effect making sure that he got the extra emolument that was voted for him.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Chairman, the ruling on the question I raised regarding our voting having a direct pecuniary interest in this matter, because I just wanted to add this, that regarding the indemnity -- now it's true that our indemnity is provided for in The Legislative Assembly Act. It's also true that if we change that indemnity we amend the Act, but there was one point that I would like to make and that is this, that we don't vote that money because that money becomes a statutory allowance, or whatever you call it. --(Interjection)--No, but I mean we're voting on it right now, but we don't vote on the statutory expropriations so we're not voting on our indemnity.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, . . . . . again I profess I'm not as learned in the law as my honourable friend the Member for Selkirk, but--(Interjection)--Yes, I think I'd make a darn good judge, far better than -- No, I cannot say, Mr. Chairman, or reflect on any member of the judiciary. But on this point, as I think somebody opposite said, that in the first instance, members of this Assembly must have voted in order to set up the statutory appropriations for members of the Legislature and I would suggest that Her Majesty the Queen back in 1870, under The British North America Act, did not say that the members of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba would receive X numbers of dollars or pence or whatever was the currency foundation at that time. I would suggest that that time it was the members of the Legislative Assembly and I would suggest too, insofar as the problem that we have or the proposal that we have before us, if this is adopted by this Assembly, as I suggest that the original indemnities were established by the first Legislative Assembly of the Province of Manitoba back in 1870, then from now on out after this year, that is of course providing this legislation passes, it will become a statutory condition of the Assembly--(Interjection)--Why certainly, certainly. And maybe, Mr. Chairman, I should be a judge of the realm.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I'm going to move that the committee rise in a minute or two, but I just wanted to say to the members of the House that after the committee rises I intend to move the motion of condolence in connection with the death of the late Mr. Jack St. John, and I would just like members to know that I intend to do that as soon as the committee rises. I vote, Mr. Chairman, that the committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the Speaker.

#### IN SESSION

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

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

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, as I stated a moment or two ago, I think the House would wish to take the first occasion that we have available to us to bring into an affectionate remembrance the name of Jack St. John who served as a member of this Legislature for some time. I had the good fortune to be here when Mr. St. John was here and all who knew him will remember what a conscientious and able Member of the House he was and how diligently he approached his duties as a Member in this Legislature.

Mr. St. John was born in Portage la Prairie and he had a very interesting record as an athlete in his early days. He was a member of one of the Allen Cup teams from the Province of Manitoba. I think he was going -- it was the University of Manitoba Allen Cup team, and throughout his life he always maintained a great interest in all the various aspects of sport.

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd) . . . . He was in business in this community, first in the pharmacy business, and then latterly I think in real estate, and he was always very active in the affairs of the community in that particular sphere of activity. He served on the Council of the City of Winnipeg for ten years from 1943 to 1953 and made a splendid reputation for himself in that capacity and then he was afterwards a Member of this House from 1953 to 1958. I'm sure that we've all learned of his passing at the relatively early age of 58 with deep regret and that we would like to express our most sincere sympathy to his wife and to his son and other members of his family.

And so, Madam Speaker, I should like to move and in this motion I associate the name of the Honourable Member for Lakeside, I should like to move the following resolution: That this House convey to the family of the late Jack St. John, who served as a Member of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, its sincere sympathy in their bereavement, and its appreciation of his devotion to duty in a useful life of active community and public service and that Madam Speaker be requested to forward a copy of this resolution to the family.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, I'm sure that all who knew him heard with great regret of first the illness and recently the death of our former colleague, Jack St. John. I had had the privilege of knowing Jack St. John practically since his birth because his father was a businessman in Portage la Prairie. His mother was one of the pioneer Snider family in that area and Jack grew up in the Portage la Prairie district. As the First Minister has mentioned he had a spectacular career. He was endowed with a fine personality, an excellent mind and an athletic physique which led him to become an athlete of considerable renown. In addition to the prowess that he displayed in being a member of the Manitoba University Allen Cup team, Varsity Grads I believe they called themselves, he later went and played pro hockey in the United States and had quite a career there as well. Then he went in, as so many athletes do, into public life and served in the City Council and came to the Legislative Assembly.

All the way through Jack had the capacity of making friends and keeping them, and I think his contribution in the public sphere was quite as outstanding as it was in the many other lines of activity that he engaged in. Successful businessman, public-spirited citizen, a very fine friend; I'm sure that the province is the poorer because of his passing, and I would like to associate myself too with the tribute that's been paid to him and the sympathy that is extended to Mrs. St. John and to their son.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, it is with regret that I note the passing of Jack St. John and I would like to associate my party with the message of condolence to his wife and the family. I had the opportunity of sitting with Jack in this House from '53 to '58. I recall that he sort of jumped over the traces on one occasion when he introduced a resolution dealing with the question of coloured margarine into this House. This was almost unheard of for a member at that particular time. I'm sure, Madam Speaker, I also speak for those members of the former CCF Party who had the privilege of sitting with Jack St. John on the Council of the City of Winnipeg. There were differences of opinion from time to time I am sure, but this is only natural in the political life of the City of Winnipeg and the Province of Manitoba.

As a youngster I followed -- not so much younger either than the late member Jack St. John -- but I followed his career in hockey; and as the Member for Lakeside has referred to, he was outstanding as has been indicated in that field.

We regret the passing of Jack St. John and on behalf of my group here in the Legislature and those who served with him in the City of Winnipeg Council, I too join in messages of condolences and also the message of appreciation of the service that he has rendered in the fields of sport, the City of Winnipeg and this Legislative Assembly of Manitoba.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I would just like to say a few words personally in this case. I entered the House at the same time as Jack St. John and we sat on the far side, not too far from each other where the Member for Turtle Mountain and the Member for Souris-Lansdowne presently sit. In the very first session of the Legislature in which we sat, he and I shared the honours of moving and seconding the address and reply to the Speech from the Throne. We became very close friends following that. I know that all of those who sat with Jack will remember him as a very courteous pleasant man, a gentleman at all times; a man who knew what he stood for and was not afraid to express his views and yet always did so in a most gentlemanly manner. He was certainly well liked by all of the members here. It was a loss to the province when he, for health reasons, chose not to continue in public life and it is with regret that I stand tonight here to associate myself with the motion that has been proposed.

**MR. ROBLIN:** Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Public Utilities that the House do now adjourn.

**MADAM SPEAKER** presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 9:30 Tuesday morning.