

Statute Law Amendment Act, 1970

to come up later and more specifically now in respect of the pension question. We would seem to be using our position in Parliament to protect ourselves. I do not think this is something we should be doing. I do not think we can expect the people of Canada to have the respect for Parliament they ought to have if we go ahead with this proposal.

No doubt today, as on other occasions, there will be arguments concerning whether or not the proposals contained in this bill are too generous. I think they are. I shall reserve my comments on that until we reach motion No. 9. But whether they are or not is a matter of judgment, and I think it is wrong to consider any improvement in our position when we are not prepared to act on behalf of the old age pensioners or the war veterans allowance recipients until we have the white paper on social security and when we are not prepared to do anything else for civil servants except provide for the escalation of their pensions after retirement. I think this adds up to a situation which puts Parliament itself under a cloud.

I know there is one other thing that is being done in the total bill for the civil servants. But that one other thing is by no means any change in the pension formula. It does not provide any change in the amount of pension people will receive. All it does is provide for a straightening out of an anomaly between the various pension plans and the Canada Pension Plan. This arises because of the integration of all these other plans with the Canada Pension Plan. It has been discovered that when people retire early they lose something under the form of integration arrived at which is a bit unfair. That is being straightened out. But do not let anyone tell me that because we are straightening out that anomaly we have the right to revamp our whole plan because there is no such anomaly in our case because our plan was not integrated with the Canada Pension Plan. We pay for our plan separately and obtain the full benefit of the Canada Pension Plan over and above our pension as Members of Parliament. So, I say it really is unanswerable that in this bill we are doing just one thing for everybody else and are doing more than that one thing for ourselves. We are providing that our pensions will be escalated and on top of that are making our pensions much too generous and are placing ourselves in a position where we are protected in ways that others are not.

May I point out there are those who say it is different here and that because of the hazards in this job we should be protected. I find

it difficult to accept that argument. This is not a job that we seek in order to better ourselves and obtain higher pay or pensions. It is a job we are prepared to take as a service to our people. I have not heard anyone say during an election campaign that he should be elected so that he could have a good job, good pay and good pension. No; at election time we make a pledge to serve our people. I do not believe it is fair to make comparisons between the pay and conditions here and the pay and conditions of other people in other places. They are not comparable. This is a service operation. When we come to Parliament we make a certain commitment to our people. Because of all these reasons I feel in all honesty and fairness to our concept of responsibility we should not be including in Bill C-194 these things for ourselves which as I say I think are too generous. I shall come to that more properly when we are discussing my amendment No. 9 because it deals with the clause which contains the pension formula and so on.

So far as this motion No. 1 is concerned I shall draw my remarks to a close by zeroing-in on what motion No. 1 deals with. If I seem to have been wandering from motion No. 1, it is because the Chair said that on motion No. 1 we could discuss motions 1 to 8 inclusive. I am glad the Chair has agreed there shall be a vote on No. 1 by itself. I hope members will examine their consciences very closely when they are thinking about how they will vote on motion No. 1.

An hon. Member: Examine yours.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Do not worry about my conscience. I will look after that.

Mr. Deachman: You let us look after our conscience and you look after yours.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): That is fine. Hon. members opposite can make suggestions to me, but I will make suggestions to them. I suggest to them that this motion No. 1 which seeks to strike clause 13 from the bill is one which every member of this House should support. Clause 13 says that the expense allowance we are receiving, and which we have been saying for years is an allowance only and that is the reason we do not pay tax on it, shall for purposes of this pension be called "indemnity". Mr. Speaker, we really cannot ask for it both ways and expect to be respected. Either that \$6,000 is salary, in which case it could apply to the