

Here, the author deals with something up-to-date honourable senators! And here is what he writes:

"However, there is a point on which I completely disagree, and it is when people insist on maintaining on the market products which are completely outmoded, which I suspect have never been useful, which, in any case, is not in the least justified, and which still benefits from the general increase; for example, the senator has just experienced a raise, is it not extraordinary? How possibly can such a measure be justified? Do they want us to believe that in 1963 the "do nothing" is worth more than the uselessness of 1935 and that idleness must cost more for the only reason that political life in general is on the increase? It is hard to believe.

"All the more that the purchase of senators is forced upon us. If we were still free to acquire them, if they were put on sale as remnants, as discount items, the senator might become fashionable as any old piece of Canadian furniture. The increasing price could then be justified. The decorative or antique aspect of things is well paid for.

It is a well known fact that nobody would consider spending a whole evening in an old chair of the French régime. It is too uncomfortable. But it is kept as an object of art, or for a sentimental reason. Likewise, the presence of the senator in politics has become out-of-date.

This is an article from a minister now sitting in the House of Commons. I thought he was staying longer in his seat because at that time he could write freely. Mr. Gérard Pelletier has signed the article I just quoted.

This is why I consider that circumstances lent themselves well to quote this article written many years ago but which fit in nicely tonight.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to have had the opportunity to say what I thought of the situation.

Mr. Jacques Olivier (Longueuil): Madam Speaker, I had really no intention of participating in the debate on second reading of Bill C-44. However, after listening carefully to what the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) had to say, I feel I must. Tomorrow, we shall read what he said. He tried to cast the blame on hon. members of this House who are in favour of an increase in their salaries by odiously pitting them against the poor.

Madam Speaker, I feel that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre was hypocritical and unfair to other hon. members in his approach. The increase in salaries we are fighting for now, that we are claiming now, he will take it like every other member. He has just confessed to having already accepted five increases in salary since becoming a member of this House. Is that not hypocrisy? I wonder.

Madam Speaker, it is easy to play politics by hacking at the members of the House of Commons. It is much more difficult to speak in favour of the pay increase. It is easy to go back to one's riding and say: "I was against the salary increase". It is easy to say so, but members will go and cash their cheques notwithstanding. If instead of putting forward a motion to defer that increase by six months, the member had moved that those who do not want it should not be compelled to take it, I would have respected him. But he did not—

The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), Madam Speaker, has not told us what his revenues are. He has not made us aware of his apprehensions when the increase in Old Age Security Pensions was forthcoming. He does not talk about such things of course. I believe somebody who has been a member of the House of Commons for 30 years is not honest in trying to depict

Members' Salaries

other members of parliament, whether they are progressive conservatives, creditists or liberal members as twits.

Madam Speaker, I believe we are here to uphold the interests of 22 million Canadians. We are not here to indulge in partisanship. That member wants to show that we are trying to get richer at the expense of poor people. That is untrue, Madam Speaker. Let that member no longer be considered as a lamb. He will be the first to pocket the money.

Once that increase has been passed, I ask journalists to follow him and see if he will refuse it. He will not. He will be the first one to cash the check at his bank. Let us not worry about that. I think an end should be put to that hypocrisy. If we want to deal in politics, let us do so, but not at the expense of poor people, people who live on a pension, people who have to eke out a living. He does not know what poverty is.

If that man has ever represented unions, he did not represent them well, Madam Speaker, for when he says that at the outset the allowance was known, I can tell him that when I represented union members, whenever they were hired by a company, they accepted the salary which was paid to them, but six months later, if they were union members, they came to see us in order that we have an increase negotiated. If he did not do so, he was dishonest with the unions and the union members. He was dishonest with the workers if he did that, Madam Speaker.

I believe there are limits to picking on people, trying to influence the people's minds to please the press. Those people are playing politics at the expense of ordinary Canadians when they criticize salary increases. If he wants to be respected, let him introduce a motion to the effect that the increase will be paid on request only. If he turns it down, he will deserve respect. This is what I have to say.

In conclusion, in order that the problem be solved once and for all, I move, under Standing Order 6(5) (a) and (b), that the debate on second reading be concluded this evening beyond the ordinary hour of daily adjournment.

● (2130)

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): The Chair wishes to advise the hon. member that any motion must be in writing. If therefore the hon. member will put his motion in writing, the Chair will consider it.

I recognize the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt).

Mr. Olivier: I am sorry, Madam Speaker, I had put the question to the previous person in the Chair whether the motion had to be in writing. The answer, I do not question it, was no, since Standing Orders are involved. But I will comply with your requirements and put it in writing in a few moments.

[*English*]

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): Madam Speaker, I will try to be brief. The hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Gilbert) has already said most of the things I have to say.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): Order, please.