

past was provided by MPs, and then say on the other hand that these facilities should be provided at public expense.

I believe there has been a great departure in almost all of these expenditures being taken over by the government, leaving a member of parliament a much higher degree of control over his personal income for his personal life. That makes very good sense to me. But let us consider the present salary position of members of parliament in this context. We all know we are now being paid \$18,000 a year, plus a tax-exempt allowance of \$8,000, bringing the total to \$26,000. At the very least, I would argue that for the government's salary proposal to be considered acceptable even to members of the cabinet or to members of the Liberal Party in general, based on the criteria laid down by the former House leader when he introduced pay increases in 1971 the government must show that the cost of living increases which have occurred since 1971 have more than offset the indirect benefits provided members of parliament since then, at public expense, which presumably they were paying for out of their own salaries until they were introduced. I realize that in an attempt to reach a decision on this question there is no point at which perfect agreement could be reached by honest, decent men and women who consider it. This is a very important matter of serious judgment.

My personal view, and I believe that of my colleagues, is that there have been substantial increases in the expenses of members of parliament since 1971, particularly—but not exclusively—in respect of housing for members who must maintain two residences. These increases in the expenses of members of parliament, in my view, and in the view of my colleagues, warrant some increase in the pay that we must receive. It seems to me that such an increase is necessary if, according to the former House leader when he spoke in 1971, we are to have a decent, reasonable standard of living for members of parliament and their families.

However, I stress that I can find nothing to warrant a 50 per cent increase in the salaries of members of parliament. Using the government's approach of 1971—that of providing a reasonable standard of living for members and their families, together with facilities—if we consider the increase in the cost of living since then, and the increases at public expense in the services provided for members of parliament, not one cent beyond the amount of the increase in the cost of living could be justified by this government in terms of any pay proposal it places before the House.

May I call it five o'clock, Mr. Speaker?

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment

Crown Corporations

are as follows: the hon. member for Victoria-Haliburton (Mr. Scott)—Finance—Request for reconsideration of tax on pleasure boats; the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Symes)—Industry—Steel—Reason for restrictive terms of reference for Judge Estey's inquiry into prices and profits; the hon. member for Central Nova (Mr. MacKay)—Labour conditions—Possible amendments to legislation to protect union members from discriminatory treatment by unions.

It being five o'clock, the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely, public bills, private bills, notices of motions.

● (1700)

Order, please. It is my understanding that there has been agreement among leaders that the House will proceed directly to Bill C-216 and stand all those appearing on the order paper ahead of Bill C-216.

[Translation]

It is agreed that we proceed to Bill C-216 and stand the other bills appearing on the order paper ahead of this bill?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BILLS

[Translation]

ACT RESPECTING CROWN CORPORATIONS (NOT AGENTS OF HER MAJESTY)

MEASURE TO PUT CROWN CORPORATIONS ON SAME LEVEL AS
PRIVATE COMPANIES

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière) moved that Bill C-216, respecting Crown corporations (not agents of Her Majesty), be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to launch a vote-catching or puritanical war, but I shall go straight to the point.

Mr. Speaker, I introduce Bill C-216 entitled "An Act respecting Crown corporations" which are described as not being agents of Her Majesty.

The purpose of this bill is really very simple, although it is far-reaching. It is first of all a matter of fair treatment, a matter of fair recognition before the law, before the statutes, either private or public law. In order to make my colleagues on both sides of the House aware of the importance of the matter, I will give a summary of the purpose of this bill: it is to put public corporations and Crown corporations like the CBC or Polymer of Canada Limited or any other Crown corporation on the same level as private companies.

Mr. Speaker, when a member addresses the Secretary of State, asks for some information on a Crown corporation, complains about the doings of a CBC newsman, for example, or about the expenses made by the CBC, the minister