

that their attitude is not one of wringing the last cent out of the public treasury but one of trying to arrive at a solution which is fair to everyone concerned, both members of parliament and the public.

In this context I think it is important for us to discuss expenses. The hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent) made some unfortunate references to expenses, which I believe should be discussed in this House. His argument in objecting to any increase at all in the expense allowance is based on the fact that certain improvements have accrued to members of parliament since the last increase in 1970. He said, as recorded at page 2338 of *Hansard* for December 17, 1974:

First, there are the constituency newsletters; second, there are the constituency offices; third, the constituency secretaries; fourth, the weekly flight and/or car expenses; fifth, the caucus research staffs; sixth, expanded office facilities in Ottawa—

He spoke of expenses under those headings as being justifiable expenses, but then suggested that the very fact these items had been introduced had relieved members of parliament of the burden of expenses which they had previously incurred. I did not know that many members of parliament in 1970 were supporting a caucus research staff, had expanded their office facilities here in Ottawa or had rented extra rooms here, and so on. It is true that in Britain, labour unions provide these facilities for certain members of the British House. Perhaps this is also done here, but I do not know of many members who on their own supported such outside offices.

The weekly flight provisions and the expansion of members' rights to fly back and forth give members the right to fly to other parts of the country. However, the fact is that most members of parliament simply did not accept invitations which require them to travel at their own expense to Vancouver, or to some other place which is expensive by reason of its distance from Ottawa, in order to perform public functions. Therefore, there would be very few cases in which this provision would result in a saving for the individual member.

● (1620)

It is true that some members sent out constituency newsletters. I did not at that time; I could not afford it. I know most members of this House did not, but there may have been some who did. Perhaps they will be somewhat in pocket in this regard. There may have been some who operated constituency offices. I did for approximately a year before this privilege was granted by the House. The total cost was not very great when you were merely renting small premises. I am not aware of any body of members of parliament who supported constituency secretaries on their own allowances. Some received support from the riding associations to do something of that kind on a part-time basis. I am not personally aware of any members who did this out of their own expense allowance.

This tends to be a rather fraudulent argument against an increase in the remuneration which members of parliament would receive on the expense side. In fact, I wonder if we might even apply to it the description "a crock of hypocritical nonsense".

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Members Salaries

Mr. MacGuigan: On what does the member of parliament spend his expense money? I would like to give a list of the kind of expenses I have personally. I believe they are fairly typical of the type of expenses a member of parliament has. The largest of these expenses is that of housing in Ottawa. This varies greatly, depending on how much of the time the member lives in Ottawa and whether his principal residence and his family are here. I think this fact indicates how difficult it would be to submit stubs with a voucher system.

This is one of the basic decisions a member of parliament has to make. He has to decide how he can best serve his constituents. Could we possibly have a public servant who would decide that a member of parliament has no right to move his family and make his principal residence in Ottawa, as opposed to the constituency? Could we possibly subject this matter to some kind of judgment by someone outside the political process entirely? This is the kind of decision a member has to make and for which he is fundamentally responsible to his constituents on election day.

In addition to housing expenses in Ottawa there are the additional expenses of living. There is the cost of buying meals out if, as mine is, his family is in a different city. The cost of entertainment for constituents who come to Ottawa is one of the expenses of a member. How much this amounts to depends on the distance of the member's constituency from Ottawa. The closer it is, the more visitors he will have in a year. Even with the modest subsidy given in the parliamentary restaurant this can be a very considerable expense for members of parliament.

I find it necessary to have a car in Ottawa and a car in my constituency. Other members may prefer to use taxis. If they feel they can get taxis in Ottawa when they need them; they may be able to rely on that source of locomotion. Whether it is the expense of operating two cars or the cost of hiring taxis, it is very considerable, running into several thousand dollars. Unless a member literally carries everything back and forth every week, there is the necessity for a double wardrobe. There is also the net cost of making contributions to causes and events which one would not make if he were not a member of parliament. That is difficult to measure; it has to be left to the member's discretion. It could not validly be judged by a public servant, but it is still a genuine cost of this kind of life. There is also the cost of additional publications, newspapers, magazines and extra copies of official documents, sometimes for constituents who impose on you in this respect and sometimes for yourself.

The extra cost of the constituency office is one which I hope may be remedied in the not too distant future. The fact is this is also at present an expense for most members of parliament. There is the cost of telegrams and extra telephone calls. There is the additional expense of child-sitting and the additional expense of household operation in one's constituency by reason of our job, which we would not have otherwise. There is also the cost, for many members, of Christmas cards which they send to their constituents. This is a list of the kind of expenses which I have. Last year, by the best estimate that I can make, they came to more than \$12,000—considerably more than the allowance provided by parliament for these purposes.