

### Judges Act

pension after 15 years' service, which is the minimum requirement under the act? There is a regrettably small survivor's pension, but it is part of the revenue from the position.

Superior court and county court judges are paid travelling and living expenses when they are away from their homes. Has anyone ever added that to their salary when totalling their revenue, as is done every day by some uninformed, misguided person in the media with regard to the salaries of members and ministers in this House? But everyone cluck-clucks and says it is wrong that the judges had to wait so long for changes. The same is true for lieutenant governors.

Cabinet ministers waited from 1952 until 1975 to have their increment changed. I think the appreciation the Canadian public shows to these men is really great. If ever there was a thousand per cent job, that is it. There is 1,000 per cent involvement. I speak with some experience. There is no other job in this country that has so much involvement from midnight Sunday all the way through to midnight a week later.

I will not speak about the emoluments of the Chair. I went through this same problem at the time I occupied the chair. There again there was no change in the increment for Mr. Speaker. I think that was a niggardly act on the part of the nation with regard to that office.

The same applies at the provincial level. The increments are subject to income tax. I have before me a schedule drawn up by a tax adviser as to the amount of tax that will be paid by a superior court judge, supreme court judge, Chief Justice of Canada, the superior court judges of the provinces, and the district court judges. How much will be recaptured by the treasury because it falls into the one taxation year? I leave it to hon. members, who can say just how much of the retroactive part of their salary increases went to the Department of National Revenue. The net cost of that pay increase to the Crown was very much smaller than would appear.

● (1540)

I do not think it does anyone any good to behave as this parliament and the public of Canada behaved over the last pay increase. It is very easy to say it should not be done, but somewhere the buck has to stop. Someone must take a decision. We have to amend bills every now and then to pass on judges' salaries. I believe the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lang) and his advisers make the best examination of the subject they can before putting forward proposals. These may have to be altered because the minister's colleagues will not accept them. Then, in this House, are we competent to decide exactly what a judge's salary should be?

We do not seek to determine the salaries paid to public servants at the executive level. We do not try to fix the wages elevator operators should be paid. There are standards set. There is an independent committee which advises the cabinet on the desirable level of executive remuneration.

Why not set up a parliamentary commission charged with reporting every two years with regard to changes which should take place in the remuneration of judges and parliamentarians, these recommendations to become law

[Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West).]

within a certain period unless negative action is taken by way of resolution in this chamber? To my mind this would be eminently fair to all parties concerned, the public included—and the public is to be considered in this—I do not mean to add them as an afterthought.

In France a member of parliament is paid \$35,000 a year plus certain allowances; 45 per cent of that salary is not taxable. That salary is fixed by statute—it is to be the mid point, the average of the highest and lowest in the executive class of the public service. In this country it would be somewhere around SX-3 or SX-4. It is automatic—no fuss and feathers about it. Members of parliament there serve the people just as we do.

In Germany, a member of parliament is paid about \$35,000 at today's exchange rates, plus certain allowances.

When one looks at pensions I have to laugh at the *Globe and Mail* and certain other papers when they insist that members of parliament enjoy the benefit of a most generous pension scheme. They ought to broaden their outlook and get a little more information. If people are adequately paid they will pay their proper contributions. I can agree that the front end load is wrong in some cases. On the other hand, the people who serve here for six years, especially if they are professional people, cannot step out of the chamber and adjust to civvy street as easily as changing a suit on a Monday morning. There is no severance pay as there would be in private industry; if there were we could dispense with this idea of a person serving here for six years and then drawing a pension.

One must consider, too, the entitlement of the widow or the spouse of this individual, and the role that person has to play in the life of a member of parliament. This is something which the media and the public forgot. In the case of a male member, the wife has rights too—she works damned hard for them, but in all this fuss and fury, amid the stage plays that were put on here and elsewhere, this was forgotten. However, my colleagues here do not forget it. They know what it means.

So, I would say this pay increase is needed. It is indeed unfortunate that the percentages have to be so high. I am glad for the sake of the 500 or so judges affected that the media have not decided to make them kicking boards because, on the basis of the performance of last December and later on, they should be kicked all over the lot at the present time. But no, there are double standards, and I do not mind saying it. Double standards have been applied in this case.

I commend the bill before us today. I am sorry it has taken so long to get to it. I think there are better ways in which to proceed. I have suggested one, and I commend it to hon. members opposite as I would commend it to my hon. friends on this side of the House in the event we were forming an administration. There still has to be a decision made.

I don't give a damn about an argument which says we should not make up our minds for ourselves. This is what boards of directors do. It is done in all walks of life. The publisher of a newspaper sets his own remuneration. An editor who is a member on the board of a newspaper sets his own remuneration. It is not wrong for him to do so, but