

Our parliamentary doorkeepers, who render us a good deal of service here, are the ones who receive \$1,440 and \$1,320. How do they live in Ottawa on those amounts?

Then, the chief of pages receives only \$1,560 a year. I was quite surprised to discover that these amounts were as low, and that they are the annual salaries for the work these people are doing.

Also in connection with the reporting branch, where the associate editor of debates and reporter is recommended for increase, I notice that the assistants in the *Hansard* office—I believe they are classified as principal clerks—also do very heavy work, and they do it the year round. They have not had any increase recommended, I am sorry to say. I hope they will be considered even yet.

I could go on with a great many other cases, but it does seem to me that the whole question of salaries we pay here should be worked out on a comprehensive basis. I welcome the adjustments which have been recommended for some people, but I feel the whole arrangement should be looked into more thoroughly, for we will all agree that things should be done properly on our own door-step.

I trust His Honour the Speaker will be able to say that the statement he has just made, to the effect that he would ask for a survey, may include everything I have asked for.

Mr. SPEAKER: As I have already said, I shall be glad to show the remarks of the leader of the opposition to the civil service commission, and I make the same promise to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, namely, that his remarks will be seen by the commission.

Mr. KNOWLES: Would His Honour answer my question as to when the adjustments referred to in *Votes and Proceedings* for August 10 will come into effect?

Mr. SPEAKER: That is a matter which will have to be left until later. I cannot say definitely when that will take place. It is a matter which will have to be discussed by the government before it can be done.

Item agreed to.

494. To provide for the full sessional indemnity to members of the House of Commons—days lost through absence caused by illness, official public business, or order of the house, or on account of death during the present session—notwithstanding anything to the contrary in chapter 147 of the Revised Statutes, 1927, an act respecting the Senate and House of Commons, or any amendment thereto. Payments to be made as the treasury board may direct, \$28,000.

Mr. HANSELL: It will be noted that we are asked to pass this item, notwithstanding

[Mr. Knowles.]

anything to the contrary in chapter 147 of the Revised Statutes, 1927, an act respecting the Senate and the House of Commons. I do not quite understand why this stipulation is made. May I point out what I regard as a discrepancy? This item is based upon the fact that the old act allows a member of the House of Commons to be absent from the house for a period of fifteen days without losing any of his indemnity. If he is absent for more than fifteen days he loses \$25 a day. Where the unfairness comes in is the fact that this applies to all members, when in fact all members are not equally situated. A member representing a constituency in Ontario or Quebec can go home over the week-end. He may be able to handle some of his business on Saturday and spend Saturday and Sunday with his family. He is able to return Monday without losing any time.

A member from western Canada or the maritimes cannot do that. If he goes home for any reason whatsoever the time spent in travelling must be considered. There are some members of the House of Commons who are known as T to T men, that is, Tuesday to Thursday men. They are able to leave on Thursday night and return on Tuesday and lose only two days. Of course, if they do that often enough they will exceed the fifteen days. The member who lives in the west or the extreme east cannot do that. We have been sitting in this session for over six months and one can imagine what that means to a member from Alberta or British Columbia or the maritimes who has not been able to go home very often without suffering the penalty of \$25 a day.

There is another point in the act which I think is unfair. If an hon. member is sick he does not lose the \$25 a day if he is within ten miles of Ottawa, but if a member happens to be out west or in the maritimes and becomes sick, that time is counted as absent time. The best place for a man to be when he is sick is at home. I happened to have had an experience just recently. I kept a record of the days I was absent and planned to be back here under the fifteen days. I was fighting an election campaign and with all the opponents I had, particularly my C.C.F. friends in Alberta—not these hon. gentlemen who are sitting here—and with all the advertising I had to read, it was no wonder that I took sick. The result was that I could not return to Ottawa when I expected and I was away for three extra days. Technically I should lose \$75, and I cannot afford to.

The same illustration can be made applicable to many members of parliament. It