Mr. Mackasey: There is an easy solution to the dilemma of the New Democratic Party, Mr. Speaker; and there are some very sincere people in that party.

An hon. Member: Name them!

Mr. Mackasey: I say that in all sincerity. Since the bill is to be amended a member of our party came up today with what I thought was a good amendment. All members can think about it. The bill which is passed—or if it is passed—should contain a clause which would simply make it necessary for a member to apply for the pay increase if he wanted it!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mackasey: If it is against a member's conscience to take the increase, then he need not apply for it.

Mr. Leggatt: A good idea!

Mr. Mackasey: This would solve the dilemma, and we could get on with raising our own pay which we have a right to do because no other body is going to do it. Describe for me an independent committee, if you can.

Mr. Woolliams: It is like some of the independent judges.

Mr. Mackasey: Any committee might be considered as independent depending on whether you like its findings. There was the famous Clyne committee which did a pretty good job for civil servants. Mr. Clyne weighed all the facts before he recommended a pay increase for civil servants. He was a man who ran one of the world's most successful industries in British Columbia, MacMillan Bloedel, and he appreciated the value of employees. He could not tolerate people who could not do their job. He understood work, and understood that civil servants deserved a decent salary because he understood that this country deserved top rated people. Mr. Speaker, the Canadian people deserve top rated members of parliament.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mackasey: Mr. Speaker, we can turn this into a gentlemen's club, you know.

An hon. Member: You have that.

Mr. Mackasey: We can limit this place to wealthy people. In my experience that would eliminate about three-quarters of the members of parliament.

In the Report of the Advisory Committee on Parliamentary Salaries and Expenses issued in November, 1970, commonly known as the Beaupré report, there are a number of references to the opinions of a very wonderful man, the late right hon. Mr. Pearson. He was a man of courage because he brought in a pay raise in a minority government. He pointed out some of the problems of the member of parliament.

Tonight's Ottawa Journal quotes the hon. member for Fundy-Royal (Mr. Fairweather). I do not want to embarrass him as he is one of my favourite people, a man of integrity, a judgment with which I think everybody in this House agrees.

Members' Salaries

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mackasey: When he was asked the simple question, whether he would accept the increase in pay he said he would because, as a man of conscience, it bothered him that at the end of his political career he would have absolutely nothing material to pass on to his family. He will have memories, he will have his record on the statute books, his speeches to be read. But he has an obligation, as all of us have, to his family that he cannot fulfil on his present income. With no disrespect for the New Democratic Party, Mr. Speaker, I say that I will take the word of the hon. member for Fundy-Royal over that of any member of the New Democratic Party any day of the week.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mackasey: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Pearson made six points. There was the problem of maintaining two residences, one in the riding and one in Ottawa, a problem that new members cannot evaluate properly until they get here. They suddenly find themselves in Ottawa with children of school age, and the cost of living here is probably the highest in Canada. Sacrifices have to be made, and new members have to make a big adjustment to the difficulties of educating children because of the school shortage and the distances they travel to and from school.

There is difficulty in attracting young people to parliament because of the loss of income which they could be earning as lawyers or barristers. In the old days when members were only in the House 60 days a year they could earn other income.

I think it is important to notice that the financial barrier to becoming a member of parliament is being allowed to continue, and is a deterrent to many people who might otherwise like to enter public life. Parliament would soon lose its character if only the financially independent could afford to become members.

I would have no apologies to make if I had accepted the so-called 50 per cent increase last week. I feel a lot better accepting the proposal advanced by the leaders of the two main parties today, however, because to me it represents a restraint which I think we should practise. However, in the final analysis, I am not going to be judged by a columnist or editorial writer for a newspaper.

• (2130)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mackasey: I want to make it very clear that a lot of them understand our problems and sympathize with us. Let us not generalize and categorize them as reactionary. The important thing is that in the final analysis I will be judged sooner or later by the 90,000 people in the city of Verdun.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mackasey: They have judged me five times, and they have judged the NDP five times. If I could not give their candidate a 10,000 vote handicap, I would not want to come back because the people of Verdun like people who have convictions. They know this is a difficult decision for a member of parliament to make. It is embarrassing to