

into my savings in order to operate here. I am not a member of any establishment and I am not a country squire. I look upon this place as a place to work.

If I consider expense allowances justified, what do I think about our salary? I do not believe that a salary increase is proper at this time. It may be justified but it is not proper. When this Parliament accepts a salary increase of 50 per cent, or 6 per cent a year since 1963, whichever way you want to put it, we set an example to the country, whether we like it or not. I say that under the present circumstances of high unemployment we are setting a bad example at this time.

I suppose I am square enough to believe that Parliament should set an example. In my own case—and I shall refer only to my own position—I was elected in 1968. Although I may not have known what my expenses would be, I did know what my salary would be. In my opinion the 29th Parliament should be the occasion when a salary increase becomes effective.

I want to reflect very briefly on members who have served in this House for a long time. Those of us who are in the chamber now know of many cases of members who have lost contact with the work they did before they came to Parliament. They have put in their time here and have watched their bank overdraft grow. Eventually they will be defeated because the rate of turnover here is very high, and I am just wondering what they will go back to. They have, sir, both my sympathy and my high respect.

I do not like to see men such as these coming under attack from university professors and other self-appointed guardians of public morals, many of whom have themselves taken far greater salary increases than this one during the past eight years and have a security of tenure which is utterly unknown to anyone who serves in this chamber.

As I said earlier, it is easy in a sense to speak against the salary increase at this time. But there is a feature of this debate that none of us can overlook. I suppose it is best summed up in the story about the old drunk who had been on quite a bender and who finally decided he would have to return to his wife, who did not approve of his drinking. He had a friend who was a doctor, and he went first to the doctor and made some private arrangements with him. Then, he went home and went to bed.

A few minutes later his wife came in and said to him: "The doctor has called and you have to take some medicine". He asked what the medicine was, and his wife replied: "I have to give you half a tumbler of whisky". So he said: "No, the filthy stuff; I will have nothing to do with it". "John, you must". "No", he said, "take it away". Eventually, he agreed and took the whisky. Then, he said: "My dear, I think I will try and compose myself for a little sleep, but by the way did the doctor say anything about further treatment?". His wife replied: "Yes, John; I am to give you every two hours two ounces of whisky until the bottle is empty". So he said: "Well, my dear, when you come in I may be sleeping. If I am sleeping, wake me, and if I won't take it, make me"!

I am not opposed to the principle of this bill, but as I have said I consider it wrong for Canada that it should

Senate and House of Commons Act

come at this time of severe unemployment. Like other members, I have had to face the question of how I shall vote on this measure. It has not been a very pleasant decision, and although this debate has been conducted without rancour, it has not been a pleasant debate for us.

There are many actions that could be taken, Mr. Speaker. One is to conveniently absent oneself from the House at this time on other business. Another is to abstain from voting. But I am quite sure that the people in my constituency of Coast Chilcotin did not send me here to have me sit in my seat when votes are being taken. I have notified my colleagues in the Liberal party of my intention to vote against this measure. In recent days, however, there has been much honest criticism in the press. But as I have watched some of the forms of attack made on this House by publicists, I have found myself in the position where, if I were to vote against this measure, I would appear to be agreeing with the stronger and harsher criticisms of the members of this House. I am, therefore, very regretfully going to have to vote for the bill.

In closing, Sir, I must return to the position that we all know, namely that it is easy to vote against a bill knowing that it is going to pass. Am I in any different situation in that, even though I am voting for the bill, I have taken the time of the House to say that I think it is improper to bring in the bill at this time, knowing that it is going to pass? The answer, I feel, is no.

I do not think that when I tell the House that, in my opinion, this salary increase should not have been effective until the 29th Parliament, I have the right to take it in the 28th Parliament. Therefore I shall make arrangements, which will be a matter of record, whereby this salary increase does not flow to me during the life of this Parliament. I thank hon. members for their attention.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, like others who have spoken, I wish to pay my respects to the sincerity and earnestness of all members of this House as they participate in this important debate. In particular, I wish to pay my respects to those who will differ with me and may vote in a direction opposite to the stand that I shall take when the vote on second reading is called. I trust it is clear and no surprise that when that vote is called I shall vote against the bill, because I do not think that this piece of legislation should be before us, and I feel very strongly that it should not be passed at this time.

• (12:30 p.m.)

In the first speech the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) made in this House after he had become the Prime Minister and had won the 1968 election he had quite bit to say about poverty. I am referring to his speech during the debate on the address on reply to the Speech from the Throne in the fall of 1968. The right hon. Prime Minister spoke in that debate on September 16, of that year. Having told us that the most intractable problem facing us was the continuing poverty of far too many of our citizens, and having told us that poverty could not wait, he also said something in one paragraph at page