

rescinded. The remarks of the hon. member in respect of Bill C-44 are not in order under this Standing Order.

Mr. Benjamin: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I am referring not only to Bill C-44 but also Bill C-24, Bill C-47 and Bill C-23. I thought that Bill C-44 and these other bills were good examples of what we have in Bill C-24. They are four examples of the government's attempts to restrain and fight inflation not being worth the paper they are written on. I ask, Madam Speaker, what is the difference? One could refer at length to the income proposal for lieutenant governors, but I do not see much difference in that and what the percentages are from what was proposed for judges and MPs. I thought we should broaden it out a bit and be fair. There is also the case of moonlighting teachers and the salaries of professors. I think the kind of income university professors have been getting is disgraceful when they have been drawing up all kind of plans designed to help the poor. Bill C-24 is not deserving of passage, just as all the others.

I am saddened and disappointed by the position taken by the Leader of the Opposition and his casual way of passing this off, even though he was in favour of controlling prices and incomes in the past two or three years, as though it is something we do not need to worry about because one cannot just pick out lieutenant governors, and so on. I repeat, and I shall close with these comments, that we should not be increasing the salaries of those who are in the \$25,000 to \$75,000 income bracket, because surely this is where you start if you want to do something about inflation. Surely they are the kind of people who should be setting the example and leading the way.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): Is the hon. member rising to ask a question?

Mr. Francis: I rise on a point of order, Madam Chairman. I should like to refer to section (1) of Standing Order 31 which says that unless otherwise provided in the Standing Orders, no member may speak for more than 40 minutes at a time in any debate. The hon. member has spoken for more than 40 minutes.

Mr. Benjamin: Madam Speaker, I assumed that you knew what you were doing. I realized that my time was almost over.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): Order, please. The record shows that the hon. member has not passed the 40-minute limit.

Mr. Francis: Madam Speaker, the hon. member began his speech last night. I have watched carefully, and certainly by my count he has exceeded 40 minutes.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): Order, please. The record shows that the hon. member is within the 40-minute limit. The hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre (Mr. Benjamin).

Mr. Benjamin: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I knew that you and the table were keeping an accurate record, and accuracy is not something for which the hon. member is noted. I shall repeat my final sentence, because obviously the hon. member was not listening when he interrupted

Salaries Act

me. I said that we should start at the top when we want restraint and want to fight inflation: we should start with MPs, senators, corporate executives, judges, lieutenant governors, and professional people. I submit that this kind of legislation flies in the face of that principle.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Madam Speaker, I sympathize with the hon. member for Ottawa West (Mr. Francis) because while the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre (Mr. Benjamin) may not have used up his 40 minutes, from what he had to say one could easily think he had been speaking for hours and hours in terms of picayune, petty, partisan nonsense. Perhaps the fact that this should come from the mouth of such an intelligent member of the House—of course, the fact that he belongs to the party he does to some extent disavows my description of his being intelligent—could be ascribed to the fact that somewhere in the great prairies there is an election going on in the province of Saskatchewan, and the hon. member is looking far beyond Saskatchewan where his party is in serious trouble because it is a party which—

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but whatever was ruled in respect of the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre also applies to the hon. member for Peace River.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): On a point of order, Madam Speaker, may I say that I have known the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) for some time, and I would think, as the hon. member for Mississauga (Mr. Abbott) said a few days ago, he was in the process of clearing his throat ready to make a speech.

● (1240)

Mr. Baldwin: Madam Speaker, I undertake not to depart further from the rules than did the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre. Having indulged in these few pleasantries to start with—

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): If those are pleasantries, what will you use for an attack?

Mr. Baldwin: I shall have some more pleasantries later; I am just getting started. Last night the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) took the same attitude as the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) with regard to the bill that had come up before, that the place to make any suggestions as to changes in the salaries fixed by the bill is the standing committee. The Leader of the Opposition said that we are in full accord with the principle of this bill and we think there should be some increase in the salaries, but that this is a matter for the committee to decide, not the House. The House can decide to be against this bill on the grounds that we are against the principle that there should be an increase in the salaries of lieutenant governors.

I think the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre went far astray in his description of what was said by the Leader of the Opposition last night, in the same way as he disclaimed, in the course of his speech, the extent of the demagoguery which has animated his party with regard to all these bills. In a very narrow sense, what the hon. member said may be correct but it has to be construed in