

what she heard and saw, but was annoyed by what she did not hear and see.

As long as appointees to the Bench show a similar understanding of human behaviour, our law and jurisprudence are in good hands.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Madam Speaker, I did not have an opportunity of speaking on the second reading of this bill, nor of participating in the committee deliberations. Also, I did not participate in the debate when Bill C-44 was being considered by the House.

I must say, having been in parliament for some 18 years and seen some of the changes which have taken place with regard to the levels of remuneration paid to those in the House of Commons and elsewhere, that I am not confused but very concerned about the attitude shown in many quarters of this country with regard to the remuneration of people in public life or in public office. I am greatly surprised that members of parliament and Senators have been singled out by media and correspondence for an unprecedentedly vitriolic, uninformed, biased and hypocritical attack related to pay in public life.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): We saw an exhibition, both in this House and outside, on the part of the media, directors of the media, and others who should know better, which was nothing but a hypocritical, demagogical outburst. Many statements contained blatant untruths with regard to Bill C-44, as it was originally introduced.

Although flat percentages were applied to figures coming under Bill C-44, the same yardstick was not applied to Bill C-24 dealing with the salaries of Lieutenant Governors. Goodness only knows, those salaries needed changing, having gone unchanged for so many years. Although some salaries were increased by well over 100 per cent, was anything said of a critical nature? Oh, here and there we heard a tiny murmur; but was it said this was wrong, after it had been said that the increases for members and Senators were wrong? That was hypocrisy; that was evidence of a double standard. That is my first point.

Second, during consideration of this bill, Bill C-47, which first appeared on the order paper in December last, there has been a little tut-tutting on the part of the odd editorial writer, but nothing has been really said about percentages. And, remember, the percentages under Bill C-44 were all wrong—

[Translation]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member but I must inform him that he may not discuss bills that have already been passed.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Madam Speaker, I do not want to criticize a ruling, but I may refer to any legislation that has been adopted. I cannot question a ruling of the Chair, according to our Standing Orders, but we may refer to such legislation. I apologize for disagreeing with the Chair, but we may refer to a legislation which has just been adopted, incidentally, during a debate, and very easily. That is done quite often.

Judges Act

[English]

Percentages were applied to Bill C-44 and great shock seemed to be expressed by some, who said that was all wrong. But on a bill which applies even greater percentages, what do we hear? Nothing. Again this shows that there is a double standard. The judges, I suppose, are not the favourite kicking boys of the media and some other people.

● (1530)

It is not that I object to the level of salary that the judges are going to get because, in the general scale of pay, they will soon be overtaken. We know what is going on at the executive level in the public service. In a few weeks we will hear the rumours about the increases due to come at the executive level of the public service. Where will members of parliament be then? They will be as newborn babes in their relative innocence.

Let us look at the provincial and civic administrations. Let us look at education, both the administrative level and teachers. There is a story in this morning's *Globe and Mail* which states that in a certain school district in this province the top is going to be over \$26,000. We must remember that has security of tenure and pension rights. There is no application of any merit principle at any time. They refused it. Their job is not on the line every few years. As far as I am concerned, my job has been on the line eight times in 18 years. Teachers work ten months of the year. It is true they have to do some other things, but there is no such thing as working 12 months a year.

Let us look at industry. The so-called blue collar workers now receive \$12 or \$13 an hour with a guaranteed 40 hour a week and plenty of overtime all year long. True enough that may be the aristocracy of the blue collars, but before the last pay increase went through, on the basis of time put in by an average member of parliament, he was paid at the level of a plasterer's labourer. He was actually paid less than \$5 an hour. When you work out the \$1,800 a month salary, which is \$450 a week, it comes to \$5 an hour.

I find it ironic that in all of the discussions it was felt that people in this House after four years, and in my case as in many others for the third time in 18 years, were contemplating a change in salary levels. The number absolutely overwhelms me. I ask those who criticize, where do they sit? How have they benefited? What percentage increase did they get in the interval? Do they have other income? We sometimes wonder about their great stories here. We wonder what are their sources and responsibilities. Do they have children to educate? How far do they live from Ottawa? What is the cost of separate homes?

In so far as the judges are concerned, there are some similar considerations. A judge has to be the leader of his peers among lawyers. He is a man who has worked hard to reach that desired degree of excellence that we hope to have in our judiciary.

The salaries proposed in this legislation are not out of line. It is rather funny when you consider that a chief judge of a county court goes up more than 70 per cent over the proposed schedules of this bill and he will get the benefit of retroactivity. Up to now the judges have had a non-contributory pension scheme. Has that ever been translated into actuarial value? What is the value of a