

memory serves me aright, in the discussion at the time it was pointed out that it was difficult to make adjustments very frequently and that the adjustments that were then made would take into account future years as well as past years. If an adjustment had been made for the past only, the increase would not have been so high. Therefore, I do not buy the argument that we go back seven and a half years, because I am certain that at least half of that time was taken into account in the adjustment made in 1963.

The simple fact is that this represents a 50 per cent increase in salary for a Member of Parliament in one crack. If it is also being done for the moguls and mandarins in the public service, I object to that as well. If they can make more in private industry, then I suggest they should go out and mislead private industry instead of misleading the government and the people of Canada, as so many of the mandarins have done and are doing now. This is too large a chunk of increase for me to buy.

As for the additional non-taxable allowance, I think expense vouchers would have been preferable. I take second place to no one in this House in wishing that the facilities of members could be improved so that we could improve our service to our constituents. I do not believe that the British system is so right. There are many things in the British system upon which we have improved. I have long ago cut my apron strings from the head of what used to be the Commonwealth and Empire but what is now just the Commonwealth, of which Britain is a member like any other member country of the Commonwealth. This has brought about a great improvement in international relations.

I see no reason for following the British example regard to facilities. I find nothing more depressing than to go to Westminster and see a Member of Parliament dictating to a secretary in the hall. I think we have made some improvements in this country in this regard. When I first came to live in Ottawa in the late thirties I remember visiting Mr. Coldwell and the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands, who had just been elected, both of whom occupied the same room. They had no secretary but had to get a typist from the pool whom they brought to their office. Although there has been some improvement, a great deal more improvement is necessary before our work can really be as effective as it ought to be. Until very recently I, like other backbench members of the House, occupied an office with my secretary. I always found awkward the fact that she had to walk the halls of this building for at least half the day while I was being interviewed or was interviewing someone in my office. So our facilities do have to be improved.

I simply could not get, no matter how much I tried, some little improvement from the government in the amount of money allocated to research for opposition parties. The \$35,000 a year allotted by the government to our party about three years ago has not been increased. We have to provide for increases in staff, or for better staff if possible, out of that amount. I have spoken to members of the cabinet many times in the past two years about making some little improvement, but have always been turned down.

Senate and House of Commons Act

I say to the President of the Privy Council that this would be one improvement in facilities that would help the members of my party as well, I am sure, as the members of other parties, including the government party. I could not even get a \$10,000 or \$15,000 increase in order to improve the salaries we have to pay to three people, plus a secretary, plus other expenses to which the \$35,000 had to stretch. We have to provide for three researchers, a secretary and meet these other expenses out of a total of \$35,000.

Our services to our constituents ought to have first place. We ought to be able to afford an office and some staff in each constituency, particularly in large constituencies. I might be able to do without in my close metropolitan constituency in Toronto which is very small in area. Those who represent constituencies that stretch over tens, sometimes twenties, of miles long and wide certainly need assistance to enable them to travel in a proper manner, adequately and quickly. Such services are essential.

I should like to ask the President of the Privy Council why the expense of providing these services cannot be met by a voucher system. This would not denigrate the position of a Member of Parliament. We would have the \$6,000 non-taxable allowance as before, though the Beaupré committee objected to it and I agree with their objection. With a voucher system, additional expenses would have to be set out and only those who incurred such expenses would be reimbursed.

There is no restriction on how we use the \$8,000, as was the case with the \$6,000 also. The problem is in the context not of mistrust of any member but in the context of the taxpayer outside the House of Commons who, before he is allowed any deductions from his taxable income, has to show how he has expended certain moneys. He has to prove his expenses. Assuming that he donates to charity more than \$100, he then has to prove every penny he has spent.

The average taxpayer of Canada has the right to ask: What is it that places the Member of Parliament in such a special position that he can get eight thousand bucks a year for which he does not have to account, and with which he can do anything. It is in the context of the best interests of this institution in the eyes of the people that I raise all these points.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard): Order. It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles)—Veterans Affairs—Compulsory transfer from non-taxable war veterans allowances to taxable guaranteed income supplement—Application of tax relief to 1971; the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow)—Finance—Representation of general public on banks' boards of directors.