

*Salary Act*

some problem about trying to do it without an act of parliament because of the provisions in the BNA Act. In both cases the BNA Act says that parliament shall fix the salaries, namely, the salaries of judges and lieutenant governors. In the case of members of parliament I think the idea of getting an outside opinion has merit, but I do not think that we should be excused from taking the responsibility as members of parliament for any changes we make in the levels of our own salaries. However, my views in that area are well known, I hope, and it is not necessary for me to spin them out again tonight.

With regard to the salaries provided in Bill C-24, the hon. member for Edmonton West has already pointed out that in one case the bill calls for an increase of over 100 per cent, that is in the case of the lieutenant governor of Prince Edward Island whose present salary is \$16,000 a year and which, under this bill, will go up to \$35,000 a year.

The salaries of lieutenant governors of seven more of the provinces go up from \$18,000 to \$35,000 a year. The salary of the lieutenant governors of Ontario and Quebec go up from \$20,000 to \$35,000 a year. At least one thing is being established in this area of work, namely, a national rate instead of regional rates, which cause us trouble in other areas.

My view is still the same view that I expressed on the salaries of members of parliament, Senators, cabinet ministers, and judges, namely, that at a time when the people of this country as a whole are being asked to exercise restraint and when we are anticipating a budget a week from tonight which may well have some rules for restraint in it, the percentages of increases in a bill such as this are too high. Therefore, without spinning it out in a multiplicity of words, I simply say that I take the same views I took on second reading of this bill—I think that this is not the time for us to be making increases of this magnitude in the salaries of the lieutenant governors.

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

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** No.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** All those in favour will please say yea.

**Some hon. Members:** Yea.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. Members:** Nay.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** In my opinion the yeas have it.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** On division.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I declare the motion carried on division.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

● (2020)

**STATUTE LAW (STATUS OF WOMEN)  
AMENDMENT ACT, 1974**

MEASURE TO ESTABLISH EQUALITY OF STATUS FOR MALE  
AND FEMALE PERSONS UNDER CERTAIN STATUTES

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-16, to amend certain statutes to provide equality of status thereunder for male and female persons, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, is there not a report stage amendment?

**Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare):** Mr. Speaker, there have been consultations between various parties in the House and there seems to be an inclination to agree to consider two amendments which are reproduced on the Order Paper and Notices for Monday, June 16, 1975, namely, an amendment to amend the Canada Labour Code and an amendment to amend the War Veterans Allowance Act. These amendments, in order to be considered at report stage, would obviously require the unanimous consent of all hon. members of the House.

As I said, some consultations have taken place, and I understand that there is a disposition to have these amendments considered as clauses 23 and 24 of the bill which is before us tonight, Bill C-16.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. Hon. members have heard the remarks of the minister. Because of the silence and because all hon. members are looking at the Chair in such a way that it indicates some kind of consensus—

**Mr. Baldwin:** And acquiescence.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:**—and acquiescence, as the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) has just said, I think the Chair does not have to intervene at this time to prevent the House, by unanimous consent, from following the suggestion put forward by the minister and considering this amendment which is moved at report stage. Although there seems to be unanimous consent, I think before inquiring of the House whether there is full consent, perhaps I should warn hon. members about this kind of precedent which, in my mind, should not be considered as a new way which we should use to modify our normal legislative process.

Hon. members are aware of the fact that the bill which is before us was meant to modify certain acts: the Canada Elections Act, the Criminal Code, the Immigration Act, the Public Service Employment Act, the Pension Act, the Civilian War Pensions and Allowances Act, the National Defence Act and the Unemployment Insurance Act, but not the Labour Code and the War Veterans Allowance Act. Although there has been a new Royal Recommendation brought forward to support the amendment proposed by the minister, and proceeding by unanimous consent, this should not prevent the Chair, from bringing to the attention of hon. members that this does put aside the normal and long established legislative process, and I think it is the duty of the Chair to warn hon. members about this kind of process and to enter a caveat about this