

*Judges Act*

**Mr. Rodriguez:** I was elected to the Parliament of Canada. However, Dave Barrett, the premier of British Columbia, did not run around the country during his election campaign talking about wage freezes. The New Democratic Party did not talk about wage freezes in the last election. I heard the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) put the Conservative members in their place. Boy, did he ever!

The hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) is a pretty elitist lawyer. He represents one element in this country, the elitist establishment class. He is building a little nest egg for the future.

**Mr. Woolliams:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Rather than let hon. members engage in dialogue, we should stay on the track of the bill and carry it on to completion.

**Mr. Rodriguez:** When this House decides wages for its own, it throws restraint out the window. There is no talk about wage controls. One of the arguments put forward is that lawyers in private practice make \$100,000 or \$150,000 a year. That is only because they are skinning the public.

**Mr. Benjamin:** Nationalize them.

**Mr. Rodriguez:** It is only because they have been taking the Canadian public to the cleaners. I have seen the bills that have gone to the finance committee. They guarantee lawyers a job for the rest of their lives. This bill gives them a guaranteed annual income for their retirement years.

The wage proposals in this bill for judges are absolutely inflationary. When the trade unions ask for 16 per cent or 20 per cent, they are told their demands are inflationary. There is nothing more inflationary than the proposals in Bill C-47. It is a travesty on the system.

Hon. members should put their heads in the sand when they talk about wage restraints. Wage restraints start with the leaders, not the followers. It is about time we started restraining spending. The Tories are great ones to talk about restraining spending. When they talk about spending on themselves, or on those in their class, there is no restraint. However, when it comes to the workers on this Hill who do the most menial jobs, they receive poverty wages. I am opposed to this.

I will support the amendment presented by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). It is a very reasonable proposal. It is certainly in line with the kind of role the government is trying to play with regard to the economic situation in this country. I appreciate having had the opportunity to make these remarks this evening.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) has proposed an amendment which, as he said in his argument on the procedural point, must, in order to qualify as a reasoned amendment at this stage, add in opposition to the progress of the bill a declaration of some principle contrary to the provisions of the bill or to the principle of the bill.

[Mr. Lawrence.]

The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre made reference to a previous ruling by the Chair. I would refer him as well to a ruling quoted by the Chair on the same subject, both by the Speaker of the day and reported in the same volume of Votes and Proceedings, that he cited in referring to the ruling of the Deputy Speaker. There is an extensive discussion about the practice in the British parliament which has been taken on here of allowing at the second reading stage, on an amendment at second reading, a declaration to be added to the motion. It discusses the limits that should be put upon such a declaration.

That declaration must clearly have two conditions. First, it must be a declaration of principle. Second, it must be a declaration of principle opposed to the principle of the bill.

Since it would appear at first examination that talking in terms of a certain specific percentage or certain specific dollar increase for judges in a year would scarcely be regarded as a matter of principle, but rather what is a matter of degree, application, or extent of the increase which is contained in the bill, one would have to determine how that becomes a principle as opposed to a specific figure.

It is suggested in the argument that it has become a principle because it is enshrined in some guidelines or proposals put forward by the government. It is not for the Chair to question whether in fact such guidelines or proposals have indeed been put forward. Even if they had, would that make the figures change from being simply figures into being a principle or statement of principle? I rather think it would be most difficult to accept that proposition. I therefore have the greatest difficulty and reservation in finding that the figures of 12 per cent or \$2,400 a year have changed from being simply figures, or degrees of increases, into becoming principle.

Second, even if I were to accept the fact, which I do not, that that was a statement of principle of some sort, I would have the greatest difficulty in finding that as being a principle which is totally opposed to the principle of the bill if I should accept, as I think I should, that the basic principle or the primary principle of the bill is that of increasing judges' salaries. In other words, aside entirely from the difficulty of accepting 12 per cent or \$2,400 as a statement of principle as opposed to figures, what that says is that the principle of the bill is satisfactory if it were to go only to 12 per cent or \$2,400, but the principle of the bill is not satisfactory if it goes beyond that figure.

I would have to find it is not a statement of opposition but of a principle if it is a principle opposed to the principle of the bill, but only opposing the bill conditionally or up to a certain point.

Accordingly, with the deepest of regret, I cannot enlarge or swell the ranks of the members who have had success in the acceptance, at least until this moment, of reasoned second reading amendments and I have to reflect the amendment as not being procedurally acceptable.

Is the House ready for the question?