

per cent in the expense allowance does not fit the word "modest".

One of the main reasons for my opposing this bill is that I think that the increase in it is too great. I am hurrying on so that I can conclude at one o'clock rather than carry on after the lunch hour. It is almost a case of putting the rest of my remarks in terms of headings. May I say that another aspect of this legislation which I think is totally wrong is the continuation of a portion of our pay on a tax free basis. It is a special privilege and it should end. Beaupré was very much against this. It is what is criticized perhaps most by the Canadian people, and they have the right to do so.

I think that if the government was not prepared to recommend that the tax free \$6,000 be incorporated into the total pay, at least it should not have made it worse by raising the \$6,000 to \$8,000. I think it would have been proper, straightforward and honest if the government had said that the present \$12,000 salary and the \$6,000 expense allowance is the equivalent of about \$21,000 or \$22,000 if it were all taxable, and should have said, this is where we will start, we will give members \$21,000 or \$22,000 as a base and perhaps add \$1,000 or \$2,000 to that as an increase, but I insist that all of it should be taxable.

I was here when Mr. King brought in his provision in 1945. We knew then why he did it. He felt that members should have an increase, but he wanted to do it in a way that would give them as much as possible without sounding that way. It was his concoction to have \$2,000 tax free in our hands but taxable in the hands of Senators. However, I think that was wrong and it should be changed. Some day it will have to be changed, but the longer we put it over the larger the increase will have to be to achieve this, so the time to end this tax free special privilege is now.

I see it is one o'clock. May I say in a sentence that the other point about this legislation that I think is wrong and that is offensive to the Canadian people is to make it retroactive to last October, with the result that we will get half a year's increase in one cheque. Let us think of how working people have to struggle and wait to get increases and how little retroactivity they get, how much they wish they could have a decent amount of retroactivity, while all we have to do is to vote for a measure like this and we get it. It falls into our lap.

Perhaps I have strayed a little from my desire to speak in a low key. If that is the case I have done so because I feel very strongly about this issue, and I shall govern myself accordingly if this bill passes. I repeat my respect for those who disagree with me but I plead that this measure is wrong because the increase is far too much, because of the tax free element, and because of the retroactive provision. I plead also that what we are doing is wrong because we are giving society the wrong lead. Instead of those of us who are at or near the top in improving our own position, some of us, and I include myself, should be saying it is time for us to hold the line until those further down catch up.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. It being after one o'clock, I do leave the chair.

At one o'clock the House took recess.

*Senate and House of Commons Act*

**AFTER RECESS**

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

**Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley):** Mr. Speaker, on rising to speak in this debate on a bill affecting very directly the individual members of the House, and particularly where it affects them the most, that is, the pocketbook, a member has to proceed with care in what he says so that by misconstruction or misinterpretation he does not reflect in any way on the views seriously and frankly held by other members.

Before lunch I listened with a great deal of interest to the hon. member for Coast Chilcotin (Mr. St. Pierre). He started his remarks by saying it was so easy to oppose this measure because then you were on the side of the angels. Mr. Speaker, without in any way questioning his divine guidance or relationship with spiritual bodies, I find it most difficult to speak, because closer than the angels are fellow colleagues in the House who feel very seriously about this matter. I hope therefore my brief remarks will not in any way be misinterpreted by them.

**Mr. Baldwin:** Besides the angels don't forget those in the other place.

**Mr. Nowlan:** The hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) refers to the other place. Well, I have something to say about the other place and it is not angelic. I intend to be brief, Mr. Speaker, because members have long awaited a salary review and any prolonged effort by any member could by inadvertence cut sharply against a fellow colleague. But while I intend to be brief, and I hope I am frank, I intend to be relevant and realistic.

Very simply put, Mr. Speaker, I am in favour of the principle of Bill C-242 which amends various acts and gives an increase in salaries, and provides an adjustment in expense allowances. But I am against the size of the increase. To my way of thinking, a 50 per cent salary increase at this time is indefensible. Because of the dire need of so many members, I give full credit to the government for having the courage to face this problem. I am afraid, however, that in trying to resolve the problem with this measure it merely postpones tackling the perennial problem that we have had from time immemorial of trying to find a device whereby we can regularly review both our salaries and expenses.

I am against the salary increase because it is 50 per cent of what I am earning now even though, as with all Canadians, any salary increase is immediately bitten into by taxes. I am against the salary increase because the same increase is provided for members of the other place. I do not have any angelical feelings about the other place. I do not believe that being a member of the other place is a full-time occupation, and I very definitely believe that being a member of the House of Commons is a full-time occupation. Because I believe this, I can see no justification whatsoever for providing an increase in salary for members of the other place.

In a general way, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the very credibility and relevance of this institution are involved in this measure. I do not intend to prolong the agony of