

Council (Mr. Sharp). At that time it was not simply the consent of the House that later in the day consent would be sought to revert to motions, but it was an actual order that we would revert to motions later this day. Technically later this day stops in two minutes. Therefore, if we are to obey our own order we must either interrupt the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre and revert to motions, or fail to see the clock. I did not want to be in the position to do either one, but I did want to say to hon. members that either we revert to motions at this time or we understand that, in failing to see the clock in a moment or two, we are not in any way prejudicing the previous order. Is that understood and agreed?

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): I think there is general understanding that we keep our eyes away from the clock.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: Stop the clock.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I am glad you heard those of us who said "stop the clock" and that you did not hear my friend who said "stop Stanley".

An hon. Member: You made your point.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I shall only be a few minutes longer. I am answering the point the Prime Minister made this morning. I think that what we did with respect to indemnities, what has been done with respect to top civil service salaries, \$50,000 and \$60,000 salaries and big pensions for them, has all contributed to the inflationary psychology which has created or aggravated the problem which we have today. I do not think we should add to it by the action of improving our pensions further at this time. Therefore, because we do not like what is being done with respect to members' pensions, because we want to protest against that as strongly as we can, because we do not like the failure of the bill that is now before us to deal with the issues that a number of us have raised, because we feel this whole operation has been a shabby one and is very disappointing, we shall vote against the third reading of this bill.

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): I want to say just a word, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall) has already expressed the disappointment of my party that a good many things were not dealt with in this bill. However, let me just say a word about the retirement features, without provoking a debate, I hope, at this stage.

● (1700)

The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) opposes the escalation figure, and I cannot agree with him in this respect. For one thing, the continued escalation based upon actual salaries and emoluments is realistic. I think a freezing at \$18,000 per year is not right. I think, too, that if this freezing at \$18,000 were to continue, we would very soon get into an anomalous situation parallel to the situation of the public servants, with whom the bill has dealt in part. We would very quickly get into a situation where it would become financially disadvanta-

State Pensions

geous for a member of parliament to continue to serve as a member of parliament, rather than to retire and receive the benefit of the cost of living escalation which is built into the retirement pension. I think this is indisputable.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: There may very well be faults in the pension which exists for members of parliament. It may be too generous in a number of respects, but I suggest if it is too generous this relates to the period after which one could qualify or the age at which one can qualify, and if there is going to be a re-examination of the pension those are two areas which should be examined rather than trying to freeze the rate of emolument upon which the pension is calculated for those, perhaps, of long service.

I suggest to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre that two wrongs do not make a right. I suggest to him that he is tackling reform of members' pensions at the wrong time. The escalation of the salary range upon which the pension is calculated is right. But I would be all in favour of another look at the period of qualification and the age of qualification because it seems to me that if there are faults in our pension system—and there may be—it is in those areas. I suggest that if the House were to adopt the position taken by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre today, we would quickly get into, among other things, injustices and anomalies with regard to members of parliament who retire, and we are going to build into our parliamentary retirement system an inducement and an encouragement for members of parliament to retire rather than serve their country.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: Those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: Those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.
And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Speaker: Before calling in the members, which I am required to do by the Standing Orders, I again want to reiterate that we do have a matter of business to deal with for which there is some compulsion, and perhaps it might be more orderly first to deal with the adjournment motion which is here now and then call in the members for the recorded division on the measure before us.