

*Salaries Act*

an exceedingly narrow sense, if one has to examine this against the whole broad background of the national and international economic situation, what the hon. member is saying is just as demagogic as what was said by some of his colleagues on the other bills dealing with salaries of members of the House and salaries of judges.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Baldwin:** That demagoguery was found in several parts of this House; it was not necessarily all in the NDP.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Explain!

**Mr. Baldwin:** It is patent nonsense to argue that, for example—taking the lieutenant governors whose salaries are the subject of this bill—the last occasion on which we dealt with these salaries was 1963, because in the same way a number of years elapsed before members of parliament and members of the judiciary received an increase in their salaries. If anyone suggests to me that the time which elapsed was of such a length that there was ample opportunity for those who felt it their duty to set an example at the highest level, I say that an example was being set in this House with respect to the judiciary and lieutenant governors. But did that stop people from demanding, and receiving, a larger share of the economic pie than perhaps was justified—such segments of society as industry, business, international unions and other people? I will not go into a preview of the budget debate, but to listen to the arrant nonsense to which we have had to listen inside and outside the House is, to me, quite objectionable.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Baldwin:** I think we should look at the true picture. Indeed, people should try to set an example; but we have to go beyond that. What we are finding now—and it is true with regard to lieutenant governors, the judiciary and members of parliament—is that when many years ago this country and other countries set their course on a pattern of developing social assistance programs, with which I and other members of the House agreed, we failed to take into consideration the necessity of linking them to the capacity of the country to sustain and support them. For the last 10 or 12 years people have been demanding, and receiving, more than we have been able to produce in this nation through people in the agricultural sector, the labour sector, industry and individuals who by their ingenuity have created an economy of usefulness and value. As a result, we are facing a very serious situation with regard to inflation.

This is not the time to go into that matter, but I want to make it plain. To say, as my friends to the left have been saying and as we have heard through the media and in the country, that a small group of ten people, whose salaries obviously have been inadequate over the last 12 or 13 years, should now be the subject of attack such as was launched by members of the party to my left is, to me, completely inexcusable. It is not a situation which has contributed in any sense to the inflationary processes in this country, and I suggest that we have to look much deeper for the causes of this situation. The kind of dema-

[Mr. Baldwin.]

goguary which we have heard from that party is simply nauseating.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Baldwin:** It should have no effect on the approach of hon. members to the bill that is before us.

**Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to follow the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) in this debate. Although I know there are differences of opinion among members of the House about the devotion of some members from time to time, I do not think any person in the House would indicate anything but the highest regard for the involvement in all aspects of public life of the hon. member for Peace River.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** When we look back over the difficulties and vicissitudes of public life, not only of members of the House but of members of the judiciary and of lieutenant governors, and the restrictions on life in general, we should listen very carefully to the words of a person who has made great sacrifices in order to serve his country in this House. Having heard the member of the NDP who just resumed his seat—I do not wish to cast any reflections on him—I feel bound to say that I heard a speech by the resident hypocrite of the House of Commons.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Benjamin:** I am glad you are trying to be nice.

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** I hope that when the time comes at the end of this month to collect the bounty that has been given to us and for which all of us are grateful—most of us, in any event—he will be at the front of the second line, that is, the line of those who will turn their money over to some worthy charity such as “Beans for Benjamin” or something like that.

● (1250)

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** I think it is extremely important that we recognize a couple of facts about lieutenant governors. There are lieutenant governors in each of the provinces, and each province has treated its lieutenant governor a little differently in terms of the prerequisites of the office. Some lieutenant governors, for instance, are supplied with homes. However, I am advised that the NDP government of Saskatchewan in 1944 decided to do away with having a home for their lieutenant governor, through some mystical form of tokenism with regard to savings, and ever since the person who occupies that office has had to rent a suite in keeping with his position. The people of Saskatchewan and the successive governments of Saskatchewan have regretted that shortsighted tokenism. The government of that day, as I recollect my history, was led by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas).

I think we have to be careful when we consider the positions some men and women of this country are privi-