

relationship and not an industrial wage relationship. However, those are details.

The fact is that the principle behind the bill, even without the suggested amendments, is for a substantial increase in the allowances for members of parliament not out of line with the industrial composite or the cost of living. Therefore the principle of the bill respecting a significant increase for members of parliament is proper. It is on the principle of the bill that we vote on second reading. I must say that, on principle, I intend to support this bill on second reading.

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

[Translation]

**Mr. Jacques Olivier (Longueuil):** Madam Speaker, may I ask whether you have received the written version of my motion?

[English]

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin):** The hon. member for Longueuil (Mr. Olivier) has put a motion under Standing Order 6(5)(a). All those opposed to the motion will please rise.

**An hon. Member:** What is the motion?

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin):** It is in French.

[Translation]

**Mr. Jacques Olivier (Longueuil)** moved, pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 6(5)(a):

That the House continue sitting beyond the ordinary hour of daily adjournment in order to complete the second reading stage of Bill C-44, to amend the Senate and House of Commons Act, the Salaries Act and the Parliamentary Secretaries Act.

[English]

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin):** All those opposed to the motion will please rise.

*And more than ten members having risen:*

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin):** I declare the motion withdrawn.

Motion (Mr. Olivier) withdrawn.

**Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** Madam Speaker, I make no apology for rising at this late hour because I do not think this legislation should be hurried through with indecent haste. As a matter of fact I am surprised that a matter of such widespread importance should have been dealt with in such a hurried manner today. The government has put up only one speaker in support of the measure, the Social Credit party two, and the Conservative party none at all.

The desire seems to be to hurry this legislation through as quickly as possible. If this were a bill to increase the salaries of postal workers by 50 per cent, there would be no end of speakers hurrying to get on the list to take part in the debate. Here we are trying to hurry through in one day a bill which, if not changed, will increase the salaries and expense allowances of members of parliament by some 50 per cent.

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

### *Members' Salaries*

**Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** I suggest to those members who are anxious to express their views by frequent interruptions that the best way to do that would be to get into the debate. I agree with the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Gilbert) who said a while ago that this is a matter which ought to be debated. It affects every member of parliament and all of our constituents who have to pay the shot. There ought to be a widespread discussion.

We are not going to agree. We do not agree in every party. There will be differences of opinion within every party. However, we ought to be able to discuss this in a mature and grown-up manner without hurling back and forth the rather childish accusations such as were made by the hon. member for Longueuil (Mr. Olivier) just a few minutes ago.

Every one of us who has sat in this parliament or any other elected body has had to go through this periodic ritual dance of deciding what we are going to do about our own salaries. This is a very embarrassing position to be in, and I think all of us feel that it is a very sensitive question.

The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. MacGuigan) quite correctly said this afternoon that this matter has to be dealt with by members of parliament because there is no one else who has the power to deal with it. However, I suggest we must find some better way to deal with this matter of how much we are going to be paid out of the public treasury.

I have watched this same situation arise periodically. You can almost write the scenario. Those who are in favour of increasing members' salaries point out the large amount of work they have to do, the long hours they put in, and the interference with their family life, all of which is quite true. They point out that many professional people earn much higher salaries than do members of parliament.

● (2150)

On the other hand, those who question the advisability of raising the indemnities of elected members call attention to the fact that there are many groups in our society which are not as favourably placed as those of us who sit in the House of Commons. And there is always a tendency for this debate to end up in recriminations—those who support the measure to increase the indemnities are accused of having a hand in the cookie jar, of thinking only of themselves, and those who question the advisability of raising members' salaries are told they are being self-righteous, that they are really going to take the money but just want to make political hay by opposing a measure which may be politically unpopular. I think that is descending to a pretty low scale of debate.

I am prepared to recognize that members of parliament are sincere in the positions they take. I think there is a great deal of logic on both sides. One of the things we ought to have done long ago was to find some better way of deciding what should be the remuneration of elected members. Every time this debate comes up we say we shall find some better way next time. Of course we never do, and periodically another bill comes in raising members' salaries and we go through the same ritual dance again. We now have an opportunity to settle this question. I was