

House to provide, in a flexible way, for the transportation and telecommunications expenses has been somewhat hampered by restrictions in the present act. This will give the House an opportunity, if it so wishes, to provide for additional such expenses as recommended by the Beaupré committee report.

● (3:50 p.m.)

I might mention, since it is of interest, that the total increase over the 7½ year period, because it is effective October last year, is 44 per cent or approximately, if taken on an annual basis, I think a little better than 6 per cent. It may not be conclusive to any person who is opposed to this measure, but it is of interest and is helpful in making comparisons to note that between 1963 and 1970 the average weekly salaries and wages for all wage earners and salaried employees in the industrial composite rose 52.2 per cent. The salary, for example, of economists rose from between 45 per cent and 50 per cent. The salaries of engineers increased by about 50 per cent and the salaries of university professors increased from between 63 per cent and 68 per cent. It would seem that if the increases proposed here had been undertaken on an annual basis they would not be out of line with those experienced in other comparable occupations. For example, the average annual increase for managerial personnel between 1967 and 1969 has been between 7 per cent and 9 per cent.

Another instructive illustration is that engineers and statisticians have experienced pay increases averaging 8.6 per cent and 7.1 per cent in 1969 and 1970. In comparison with public servants with comparable responsibilities, the proposed salaries and allowances are not out of line. Many public servants in the upper brackets receive higher salaries, as do many executives in industry. I looked back at the debate which took place in 1954. The speeches made in that debate stuck in my mind over all those years. At that time I was a backbencher. I was so far along the backbench that I was almost out in the corridor. But I listened intently to the speeches made and those which remained in my mind were one made by the then Minister of Finance, now Mr. Justice Abbott, and another by the then hon. member for Cape Breton South, the late Clarey Gillis. I went back to these speeches. One question asked Mr. Abbott was what the salary was of the top deputy minister at that time. After some consultations with his colleagues, he stated that the top salary was something like \$17,500. I do not know exactly what the top deputy minister in our public service receives today, but the proposals of the Clyne committee have been tabled in this House and it is possible for us to determine what changes have taken place in the payment to public servants.

As I mentioned, it would seem to me to be quite difficult to equate the responsibilities and the diversity of function of a Member of Parliament to any precise category in the public service, but it is certainly not unreasonable to think that we should at least be hooked up with some executive category within the public service, and that our responsibilities are at least equivalent to the responsibilities exercised in the executive category of the

Senate and House of Commons Act

public service. Members of Parliament can take a look at what has been and what is happening in that category of the public service. At \$26,000, including the tax free allowance, the remuneration of Canadian parliamentarians are still quite below that of representatives in the United States. In the United States the salaries are far ahead of those of Canadian parliamentarians. I have often wondered why the British government allows the salaries and facilities of Members of Parliament to be so dismally low. I cynically think to myself that any government or any party which wanted to render Members of Parliament less effective would give them the least possible facilities and the least possible money so that they would have to spend much time away from Parliament earning their living, and so that when they came to Parliament they would not have the services and accommodation that would enable them to represent the people.

Some people may think a good model is the British member who we see on a bench in a corridor dictating to his secretary, who I suppose probably is someone else's secretary as well. Certainly, that kind of approach is not one to which we generally subscribe in this country, nor is it supported by the Beaupré Report. We have heard from the distinguished new leader of the New Democratic Party, and the spokesman from the Cr ditiste party, about their concern with regard to facilities and things a member needs in order to do his job. I think it would be wrong for Members of Parliament to assist in perpetuation of the idea that the \$8,000 expense account is salary. I think in this debate there can be no valid basis for disagreement concerning the method of treating the expense portion of this proposal. Mr. Speaker, any member can argue that it ought to be accountable and voucherable. That is one argument. But in my view it really is not quite cricket to argue that it can be regarded as salary because it is intended to provide a Member of Parliament with a fixed sum of money to allow him, in his own judgment, to provide those facilities and services which he thinks will enable him to best serve his constituents. In my judgment, in view of the other responsibilities we exercise daily, it is not too great a responsibility to give this opportunity to a member to decide how he will determine the allocation of the \$8,000 and not oblige him to come back and have his accounts vetted by a member of the bureaucracy who normally is interrogated, questioned and brought to heel by elected Members of Parliament.

Mr. Lewis: You mean we try.

Mr. MacEachen: So, it has been felt wise to preserve the allowance feature. Therefore a clear distinction is made between what a member receives in indemnity, \$18,000 under the proposed legislation compared to \$12,000 at present, and what he receives as an allowance to enable him to discharge his function as a member. This will rise from \$6,000 to \$8,000. I should like to make clear that the government's thinking in providing the \$8,000 allowance, and in increasing the amount of the allowance by \$2,000, is to assist members in providing additional facilities or services for themselves in order