

on people seeking wage increases to hold down their demands. It is interesting that some of these pressures come from people like Dr. John Young, Chairman of the Prices and Incomes Commission, who managed to achieve quite a boost in his income by taking on that chairmanship. And, of course, we had this same admonition a few days ago by the Governor of the Bank of Canada whose own salary was increased 50 per cent not very long ago, putting it into the upper atmosphere. If these strictures are proclaimed and if people are told they must settle, as pensioners, for an increase of 42 cents a month, and as workers for wage increases of 5 per cent and 6 per cent, we do not have in my view a moral right to give ourselves increases of the kind proposed in this bill.

As I say I wanted to mention those few precise examples, but is not so much those examples by themselves that hit me. It is this realization that in our society as a whole the gap is getting ever wider and wider, and there is no use talking about national unity in terms of provincial-federal co-operation or in terms of co-operation along linguistic or cultural lines if we have a society divided in economic terms between the ultra poor and the ultra rich. The figures show that perhaps 25 per cent of our population or 4 million to 5 million Canadians are at or below the poverty level. The things we have done may have improved the dollar position of some of those people down at that level; yes, pensioners today get more than they did 20 years ago and workers get more than they did 20 years ago, but costs have gone up and with those at the top getting more the relative position is even more disturbing. It is worse than the kind of society where everybody is poor or where nobody is away up. However, when there are a few who are away up it is more embarrassing to be poor. It is what we are doing to society by countenancing those who are at the top seeking increases in their income which I think is wrong. It is that kind of lead we should not be giving.

I should like to see others take this kind of position. There are a few around now. Jack McClelland, of McClelland and Stewart, the other night on radio or television, said that money is not everything. Dr. McClure, the former moderator of the United Church, said that what he thinks is wrong with our society is that those in the upper brackets are getting too much and that he is prepared to settle for a something less. I think this is the kind of lead somebody must give. I think those who should give it are the leaders of this country represented here in the House of Commons. Speaking for myself, I think that kind of lead should be given by all of us but, if not, I hope there are a number of us who are prepared, as I am, to see that the necessary steps are taken so that in our own position as members we do not contribute to a widening of the gap. I intend to take such steps.

As has been pointed out, Mr. Speaker, it is possible to make a case for increased pay and allowances for Members of Parliament. I do not agree with the case, but it can be made. We listened with a great deal of attention last night to the speech made by the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra (Mr. Deachman). He gave us quite a catalogue of the things on which a member has to spend

*Senate and House of Commons Act*

money, or the things on which he would like to spend money, and by the time he got through that catalogue of expenditures of course not only was the expense allowance all gone but so was the salary.

This is an exercise any of us could go through. Even I could add a few things to the list that he gave us last night. What he said is perfectly true; that is, it is a very difficult job for a Member of Parliament to balance his budget on the present \$18,000 a year. But, Mr. Speaker, most Canadians have difficulty in balancing their budgets. Most organizations have difficulty in balancing their budgets. Most Canadians, however, do not have the right to solve the problem of too little income and too much outgo by just voting themselves more income. It is that which makes what we are doing a practice which is offensive and which I believe must be reconsidered. Yes, I could make the argument made by the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra that balancing our budget is difficult, but there still is the old fashioned practice of trying to balance a budget by cutting expenditure, by sharpening pencils and so on and not just using our own power as legislators to vote enough money to cover all the expenditures with which we are faced or which we would like to be able to incur. Most Canadians have difficulty in the economic sphere. I do not think it hurts us to have difficulty as well. We are supposed to represent the people of Canada and we are supposed to know something about their experience. Let us keep ourselves in their world of experience by continuing to cope with some of the same problems with which they have to cope.

Last night the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra also indulged in some figures and percentages from tables in a book he had, all of which was very enjoyable. I suppose one could call it the numbers game. We could all do it. I might do a bit of it myself if for no other reason than to show how ridiculous it is for the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra and others to say we are really giving ourselves a lot less than would appear at first glance. When we are increasing our salary by 50 per cent and our expense allowance by 33½ per cent which averages out to 44.4 per cent it sounds scandalous and therefore members try to find a way to say it is not that much. The hon. member for Vancouver Quadra went so far as to say that if we were not to increase our pay and allowances now as provided by this bill and were to leave it at the present total, then compared with 1954 when the pay was fixed at a total of \$10,000, \$8,000 in indemnity and \$2,000 in expenses, we would have gone up per year by only 2½ per cent.

That is a nice argument, if one can make it stick. One or two of my colleagues behind me, when that calculation was being made, spoke to me in friendly terms and said I must have been crazy to stay here so long, our income having gone up by only 2½ per cent per year. This let me to do a little arithmetic of my own. You see, I first came here in 1942, 29 years ago. At that time the total take home pay was \$4,000 a year. It was the same in 1940 when the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) and the hon. member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. McLraith) first came here.