Supply

[English]

That is an important point. How many of the members who are making these remarks today have said that some members of Parliament are receiving pensions from the federal government and are here as MPs. That is double dipping.

Mr. White (Fraser Valley West): No, it is not.

Miss Grey: No. You are an MP first. It is when you are an MP first. That it is double dipping.

Mr. Boudria: How about those who used to work, not to name them, for Transport Canada?

Mr. White (Fraser Valley West): Can you redefine double dipping?

Mr. Boudria: That is an interesting proposition. I just heard the member across say that someone who is an MP first cannot double dip to be a civil servant later, but that someone who got a public service pension first can double dip and be an MP later. That is what I just heard the member for Beaver River say.

Mr. Harris: You have to get elected first.

Mr. Boudria: If that argument works for you, Madam Speaker, it does not work for me. It is illogical. A double dipper is a double dipper is a double dipper as far as I am concerned. If we are to end double dipping, it applies whether someone is a general, a colonel, an employee of Transport Canada, a retired MLA or anyone else.

Miss Grey: Or a busboy.

Mr. Boudria: Double dipping is double dipping. If that displeases the hon. member for Beaver River—

Mr. Harper (Calgary West): That is not what the red book says.

Mr. Boudria: The red book says clearly that there should be no double dipping from the federal administration.

Mr. Ramsay: Give it up, Don. You are losing, Don.

Mr. Boudria: We will see a little later how some MPs in this House react when the government's initiative is announced.

[Translation]

Finally, I want to talk about the salaries of those who serve in this House and compare them with salaries in other professions. We already know that according to a study by the OECD, Canadian parliamentarians are paid the lowest salaries of any G-7 country.

• (1050)

We also know that, in Ontario, mayors of large or mediumsized municipalities earn anything from \$63,000 to \$155,000, police chiefs make \$90,000 a year, school principals in Toronto,

\$88,000, company officers \$90,000 in small companies, \$98,000 in slightly larger ones and \$118,000 in large companies.

[English]

In terms of professionals here are some salaries: journalists, \$60,000; accountants, self-employed, \$76,000; lawyers, \$98,600—

Miss Grey: What do they get for pension?

Mr. Boudria: —dentists, \$108,400; judges, \$112,100; and doctors, self-employed, \$121,100. That is the cash compensation. If we include other benefits such as pension contributions they vary and bring some of these salaries I have just listed as high as \$139,000 and \$144,000 in some of the executive positions.

I thank the member for Beaver River for heckling that particular one. I would not have thought of bringing the total compensation to public attention.

[Translation]

I would like to read from two editorials, Madam Speaker. The member opposite said that every editorial writer was against the members of Parliament retirement plan. I submit to you that it is not the case. Let me share the following with you.

[English]

This editorial from the February 27, 1992 *Hill Times* says: "The Canadian legislator has long since given way to the professional politician. Without an adequate salary and pension plan the only people who would apply for the job today would be the wealthy, the well networked corporate union types, the weak—willed who would use the position to line their own pockets". That is what one editorial said.

[Translation]

I would like to read this other commentary, which is dated November 21, 1994. It was signed by Dr. Clinton Archibald, political scientist and professor at the University of Ottawa. In a piece entitled "Nos riches politiciens" (Our Rich Politicians), he states that the problem with the charges made by the coalition is that they rest on the premise that it would be to the advantage of the public not to pay its elected representatives well; if that were the case, we would have only one class of members in Parliament: already well–off individuals representing money interests only or aspiring to do so to compensate for their slender income.

Not all editorial writers, not all Canadians are against paying a decent salary to their elected representatives. Yes to pension reform. The Prime Minister announced that it was forthcoming. Yes to all of that, but no to holding the position that all parliamentarians should be entitled to is a paltry salary, paltry compensation, thereby allowing only the rich to be represented in Parliament.