

not make outrageous demands on society, using all kinds of padding from time to time to support our suggestions. That is what I am saying to members of this House: we should look at the situation realistically. I know that members will say I am being hypocritical and that I will take the money. I do not want to get back into the argument that took place before about conscience clauses, and that sort of thing, but I would ask hon. members to really look at what has been happening. The proposal put forward by the government will not be as beneficial to hon. members as the one initially suggested and all of us in this House, over the next couple of years, will be receiving less. There is some argument that over the entire period it will amount to the same thing, but from what I can understand we will be getting substantially less in the next couple of years than we would have received under the proposal originally brought forward by the government.

Let us not talk about hypocrisy. The stand and the fight we are conducting in this party will in fact reduce our opportunity of getting that increase in income. It will cost us money to put up this fight; I think that must be clear. If you want a test of sincerity, surely that is the test. We are going to continue this fight, and if it costs us money to do so in the sense that we get something less than the proposed salary increase, we will just have to live with the responsibility of taking that position. We will also have to learn to live with the catcalls from both sides of this House.

Let me conclude by saying that this House has a tremendous responsibility. I can appreciate how hon. members feel when they look around and see that people with perhaps less skill, who do not work as hard and make fewer sacrifices, are receiving more money. Surely that is not a good argument for us to follow but is, rather, a good argument for us to do something about what is wrong in our society in that some are getting more than their fair share. That is really the point of the whole debate.

If we continue to be seen as we are, unfortunately, seen by the people of this country, being no different and having no more conscience than anyone else—and everybody else is demanding more—it will be a sad time for this country.

Mr. Caccia: Mr. Speaker, may I call it five o'clock?

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of the adjournment are as follows: The hon. member for Windsor West (Mr. Gray)—Energy—Oil—Request for investigation of possible fraudulent increase in import prices; the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. McKenzie)—Air Transport—Crash of DC3 at Rimouski—Report alleging non-compli-

Adjournment Motion

ance with regulations; the hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie)—Airports—Request for decision to construct.

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, and notices of motions.

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I think there is some agreement to proceed with Order No. 34, Bill C-234, standing in the name of the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen).

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I do not wish to question the suggestion made by the parliamentary secretary regarding the agreement, but I have some reservation about the bill that is proposed for study by the House this afternoon.

Let me refer hon. members to a statement by Mr. Speaker on October 13, 1974, regarding the presentation of a mass of private members' bills. At that time he suggested it was impossible for the Chair to review the contents of each of these bills, and suggested that the bills be read the first time and leave it for the Chair to make a later decision regarding the procedural acceptability of individual proposals.

At the same time I feel it is unfair to come in on a day like this when there has been some general agreement as to the debate on a particular bill, and taking most of the time on a debate on the procedural acceptability of the proposal. I would be tempted to suggest to the House that there might be an agreement to debate the subject matter of the bill, but to go that far would not be following our normal procedures. I would enter a caveat in respect of our proceeding with an examination of the bill proposed by the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen).

● (1700)

This is a caveat which would at least provide for the regularization of the bill in respect of its present weaknesses concerning the lack of a royal recommendation which would be necessary in order for it to comply with the procedures of this House. I must refer hon. members generally, although I am sure I do not have to bring it to the attention of the hon. member who is proposing the bill, or of the parliamentary secretary, to Standing Order 62(1), which is quite clear. It provides:

This House shall not adopt or pass any vote, resolution, address or bill for the appropriation of any part of the public revenue, or of any tax or impost, to any purpose that has not been first recommended to the House by a message from the Governor General in the session in which such vote, resolution, address or bill is proposed.

So, because of the provisions of the standing order, and also because of the fact that another such bill was proposed in the previous parliament, Bill C-11, an act to amend the British North America Acts, 1867 to 1965, which was meant to achieve about the same purpose, which was proposed by the government, and to which was attached a royal recommendation which complied with Standing Order 62(1), I would not want the House to proceed with the consideration of Bill C-234 without giving a warning to hon. members or without suggesting to the House that, over and above the unanimous consent to proceed with Bill C-234 at this time, although it is not first in the list on