

that they should enjoy a comfortable pension on retirement, but we should not provide a financial trough which makes the English Channel look like a mere brook. Unfortunately in my view that is what this formula will provide.

I am glad to see the bill because I think it is one more reason why the government and the House must move toward a sensible remuneration review tribunal which is independent of government and independent of the influence of individual members and sectors of the public service. We are all working hard for the country, but by God, we are not paid the same way.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. David Kilgour (Edmonton-Strathcona):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to speak against the contribution aspect of the pension plan and in favour of part of the proposed salary increases. But before doing so, let me suggest that this debate shows what an absolute farce Parliament has become. The Minister of Justice and Minister of State for Social Development (Mr. Chrétien) who is on his way out of the chamber—

**Mr. Chrétien:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am not leaving the chamber. I am in my place. Surely I am allowed to stand.

**Mr. Kilgour:** Mr. Speaker, does the Minister of Justice or I have the floor?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker):** Frankly I have some difficulty being sure. If I do not see the hon. minister rising to his feet again, I will continue to recognize the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Kilgour).

**Mr. Kilgour:** There are virtually a million unemployed Canadians, inflation is running at more than 10 per cent per year, two-thirds of the persons over age 65 in Canada have incomes of less than \$5,000, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) is going through a checklist on how to disunite the country, most particularly in the west, and what are we doing?

We are discussing whether or not we should increase the salaries of judges. I should like to give a few figures. The present salary of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada is \$72,000. Now we must add \$8,000 and another \$7,000.

**Mr. Evans:** And what is the total?

**Mr. Kilgour:** It will increase his salary from \$72,000 to \$80,000—

**Mr. Chrétien:** How many oilmen in the province of Alberta make more money than the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada?

**Mr. Kilgour:** We are also discussing increasing the \$55,000 per year salaries of county court judges by \$8,000 and \$7,500.

**Mr. Chrétien:** You are irresponsible.

### *Judges Act*

**Mr. Kilgour:** The Minister of Justice is heckling from his seat as usual. He knows that if the people of Canada could listen to this sort of nonsense, they would vote each and every one of the members of this Parliament out of office in the next election; they would know how we are using the public time at this point.

**Mr. Kaplan:** Then why are you holding up the debate?

**Mr. Chrétien:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on another point of order. Let me state very clearly that the proposition in front of the House was presented to judges in a letter of the former minister of justice, Mr. Flynn.

**Mr. Lawrence:** But it was not approved by government.

**Mr. Chrétien:** It was sent at the beginning of the year and with the approval of cabinet. When I hear an hon. member from a province in which there are people with \$100 million in the bank making a fuss, because we want to give decent salaries to the very good judiciary of Canada, and making derogatory reference to the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada, I think it is clear demagoguery and acute irresponsibility on the part of members like the one who is on his feet right now.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kilgour:** I should like to inform the Minister of Justice that when my ancestor was the chief justice of the province of Manitoba in 1938, he was earning a salary of \$5,000 a year and he had to stay on in that role because there was no pension at all. To make a statement indicating that there is someone in Alberta with \$100 million in the bank is so much an argument *ad hominem* that I do not know how to grapple with it. I have maintained since I came here that anyone in the House who has taken a course in logic is under a great disadvantage, and the Minister of Justice continues to reinforce that opinion.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kilgour:** I see that my time is running out—

**Mr. Chrétien:** You are filibustering.

**Mr. Kilgour:** I should like to deal with one aspect of the bill at this time, the question of the pensions of judges as compared to those of public servants. Public servants contribute 6.4 per cent of their salaries to pension plans, with the federal government paying 9.5 per cent. Under the provisions of this bill, judges will pay 1 per cent of their salaries, and these contributions are only paper indexing. How in the name of anything that makes any sense do judges get such special treatment? Of course there is no answer; we will discuss it in committee.

Turning to the area of retirement benefits, a judge can obtain a two-thirds pension after as little as ten years of service. Public servants receive pensions of 70 per cent of their average salary over the last six years of employment after 35