

something so far out, outlandish and penurious that I could not expect any support for it. I have arrived at this figure on a responsible basis. I swallow my notion that they should not get anything at all; I am prepared to give them that much of an increase, so that they will receive \$24,000 salary and a \$2,000 expense allowance. But \$24,000 salary and a \$5,300 expense allowance is just unthinkable.

Let us remember, Madam Speaker, that a great number of Their Honours in the other place have other incomes. The number of presidents, vice-presidents, and directors of corporations in the other place is rather lengthy. They have incomes of other kinds, and the kind of money that really means something to them is money that is tax free. The salaries they receive in many cases result in their having to pay quite a bit in income tax; the money that they like is the tax free allowance, and I think it is at that point that we should make this difference. That is the intent of my motion.

We should now start moving in the other direction, looking toward the elimination of the tax free expense allowance. In our own case we could leave it where it is at \$8,000, with the thought that perhaps another Beaupré will come along and recommend to us that we reduce it next time; and we should start the reduction process right now as far as Their Honours in the other place are concerned and put the expense allowance back to the \$2,000 figure, which is what it was when it was first introduced in 1945 under the direction of the Right Hon. William Lyon Mackenzie King.

We are terribly aware of what goes on and of what does not go on in the other place. This is not the occasion to debate the question of abolishing the Senate, but I think it is worth noting, as some writers have pointed out, that it is largely the centre of Liberal party organizational activity. It seems to be a rule to have over there, with a salary and all that goes with it, the persons who head up the organization of the Liberal party. I think it is enough that they have offices, and staff, and the money they receive, without our giving them still more money. The Conservatives do not have sufficient members over there to set up any organizational activity, so they can be pure in this House on that issue, and I hope they will be. But, as I say, to provide at this time for increases in the total income of Their Honours in the other place is unthinkable.

If I had taken the position that I want an increase but I am not prepared to give one to them, then, of course, certain criticisms could be directed at me. But, as you know, Madam Speaker, I feel that this whole bill has been brought in at the wrong time. I do not just mean that it might be better to introduce it a month from now or to have introduced it six months ago; I mean that in these days of economic trouble in this country, a time when so many of our people are in need, it shows the most abject lack of leadership I have ever seen around this place for us to take this action of raising our own incomes beyond any limits that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Turner) can possibly have in mind when he brings down his budget at the end of May.

I regard this whole bill as offensive. I regard the whole bill as something to which the members of this House should have what it takes to say no. But if hon. members have not reached that point yet, we should at least say no

Members' Salaries

to any increase in our expense allowance, and we should say an absolute no to any increase at all in the expense allowance of Their Honours in the other place. Instead we should say it is time for their expense allowance to be reduced, and this is what my motion does. It lets members for northern ridings get the increase set out in the bill; it provides that our allowances generally stay at \$8,000; and it provides that allowances for the Senators be reduced to \$2,000 a year.

If members are not prepared to go for this adjustment set out in my motion, then I hope they will go for the proposal set out in the motion of the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby, namely, that there be no changes whatsoever at this time in the amount of these expense allowances.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): All those in favour of the said motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): Pursuant to section (11) of Standing Order 75, the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

Is the House ready for the question on motion No. 6?

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): All those in favour of the said motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): Pursuant to section (11) of Standing Order 75, the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre) moved:

That Bill C-44, an act to amend the Senate and House of Commons Act, the Salaries Act and the Parliamentary Secretaries Act, be amended by deleting clause 7 at page 7 and substituting the following therefor:

"7. This Act shall come into force on July 1, 1975."