

Members' Salaries

hon. members, but in reality it is not a subject which should be discussed in a personal way.

I think that all of us who have been here for a number of years have formed friendships in all parts of the House, and I would not like to see this debate straining the relationships that any or all of us have made. I have been here 13 years, and during those years I have participated in perhaps two or three similar debates about my salary. I can remember the agonizing period under the late Mr. Pearson when we earned, as the hon. member for Fundy-Royal (Mr. Fairweather) described it in the *Ottawa Journal*, the magnificent sum of \$8,000 or \$10,000. A very wise old Senator aged 92, when we were discussing a raise in caucus, said if the raise then was right it was politically right. When the NDP are saying that we should give the matter of a raise to an independent committee it is because they do not have the courage of their convictions.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mackasey: Like every other member of the House of Commons I was elected by the most democratic process in the world, and periodically I must go back to those same people and be judged on my performance. They did not give me any mandate to take any problems that are embarrassing to me and give them to some so-called independent committee because I do not have the courage to act.

What is an independent committee? Must we hand this over to the United Auto Workers president who earns \$35,000, plus expenses, to judge? Did we hear the Leader of the NDP (Mr. Broadbent) complaining today about the salary of the president of the United Auto Workers in Oshawa, plus his expense account? Not in the least. But I happen to think that the most accomplished member of the House of Commons works as hard, and contributes as much and maybe more, and puts in longer hours than ten McDerments.

The hon. member from the Social Credit Party said earlier that if we are not worth 30 cents each per year for each person in our constituency, then we have no right to be here in the first place.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mackasey: I suspect that, after reviewing their own records, the NDP have come to the honest conclusion that they are not worth 30 cents.

There is an easy solution to this problem since the bill will be amended, and I must admit that I was persuaded by the eloquence of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) today, a man for whom I have great respect. Incidentally, I feel that the House of Commons will suffer a great loss when and if he leaves this place.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mackasey: When he said last week that he was prepared to go for the full 50 per cent from \$18,000 to \$27,000, he was expressing sincerely what he thought was the value of the members of his caucus, based on his observations as a leader of that party over the last number of years. He spoke today in another vein. He spoke about restraint, and he pointed out that the problems that face this country will demand a sacrifice from each and every

[Mr. Mackasey.]

one of us over the next few years. He said that we cannot all share in the wealth by receiving precisely what we think we are worth, and that we will have to practice some restraint.

His proposal, that we agreed to today, I am sure had something to do with the discussions behind the scenes. It was a policy of restraint that we do not need to apologize for, Mr. Speaker.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mackasey: The one nice thing about the NDP is their ability to practice what they preach. Mr. Barrett, when he is not travelling around China, is busy bringing in important legislation. He brought in a little bill that raised his salary to \$52,000.

An hon. Member: Oh no!

An hon. Member: A 100 per cent increase.

Mr. Mackasey: Mind you, let me point out in fairness that it is not all salary. It is \$44,000 and \$8,000 in expenses. His cabinet ministers receive \$40,000 and \$8,000 allowance, and those hardworking members of the British Columbia provincial legislature, that in some years has put in as much as ten weeks work, only get \$12,000 indemnity a session, two sessions a year. That gives them \$24,000, plus \$8,000 tax free. I will say this for Mr. Barrett. He is one socialist who has the courage of his convictions, which is more than can be said about that party over there.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

• (2120)

Mr. Mackasey: What about Saskatchewan, the real home of Socialists? As the Leader of the New Democratic Party said today—and I intend to speak about it because he struck a very responsive chord—everybody in Canada is equal. We should all earn the same income. Well, Mr. Speaker, in 1968 Saskatchewan moved from a \$6,000 indemnity and \$3,000 expenses for a total of \$9,000, to \$12,500. That is an increase of a little more than 39 per cent in the years 1968 to 1972. But that was not quite enough.

They have another gimmick. They are paid \$20 for every day they are in the House. That would not be too bad for us who work 11 months in the year. It is not an awful lot in Saskatchewan, however, where they only work 65 days a year. Then they get \$600 for telephone expenses, and it all comes up to \$14,400, which makes for a 60 per cent increase over the last six years. I will not talk about the car mileage allowance because I am not sure whether that has been escalated since they decided to nationalize their oil industry. The cabinet had only moved up 28 per cent by 1972, however.

The province of Manitoba is a little more responsible. I think their premier is probably a misguided Liberal rather than a Socialist.

Listening to the New Democratic Party and their leader you would think that was the only party in this House that cared about people. It is just amazing. When you look at the corporals' guard, over there, however, you can see what the people almost did to them in the last election.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Acting lance corporal.