

Senate and House of Commons Act

these expenses; the member must pay them. He pays for household mailings no matter where he makes them. It is true he can get them cheaper than the ordinary man for business or commercial purposes, but still he must pay for them and they are part of his expenses as a Member of Parliament.

All miscellaneous travelling expenses, even the expense of staying overnight in the course of travelling to his riding if the trip is so long, must come out of his own pocket. Contrary to popular opinion, he does not have an air pass to travel anywhere in Canada and must pay his wife's fare. He cannot even charge taxis between airport and his home because that comes out of the magic non-accountable allowance. He does not travel first-class, as do cabinet ministers, public servants and even executive secretaries and special assistants who carry a minister's bags on and off the plane. I hear laughter in the chamber, but I think it has been the experience of every member on the backbenches to go through the first-class section and bow to the special assistants as they sit there having champagne.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Deachman: That is the gourmet tour. Finally the member gets to the economy section and struggles to a seat in the middle where he may sit for five hours on a trip to Vancouver. Does this ring a bell with anybody in the House of Commons?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Deachman: The member's only travel privileges are economy air fare or free basic rail passage between his riding and Ottawa. He does not even have the privilege of being paid for climbing into an upper berth and attempting to get his pants off in there; that luxury is not accorded to him.

There is no way of describing the expenses of an average member, because there are no average members. No one in this House wants to be called an average member. Each case is different, and that is why it has not been possible for Mr. Beaupré or any member of this House to itemize these expenses as is done for a travelling salesman whose expenses can be carefully identified. I remember how Mr. Pearson and his cabinet in 1963 struggled in an attempt to identify a member's expenses. Should an Ottawa member be cut back because he does not live far from this House?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Deachman: However, one could see in the corridor outside his room the chairs lined up for people who wanted to visit him and had access to him in his constituency every day of the week.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Deachman: When you considered that he had to campaign in his constituency 365 days a year, you realized that it was impossible to come to grips with what was fair for an Ottawa member, what was fair for a Vancouver member and what was fair for a Yukon

[Mr. Deachman.]

member. It was extremely difficult. Mr. Pearson solved that problem by giving members a non-taxable expense allowance of \$6,000 and allowing them to use it as they saw fit in administering their own peculiar circumstances—because, believe me, all members are peculiar or they would not be here.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baldwin: Some are more peculiar than others.

Mr. Deachman: There is one way in which it might be possible to split up these expenses: it is pretty arbitrary, though some members of this House of Commons may recognize themselves in these figures. Take rent, for instance, at \$2,400 a year. Has anybody in the House of Commons been able to find accommodation in the Ottawa district for \$7 a day? And car expenses: has any member who is using his car for constituency or business purposes been able to do it for as little as \$1,200?

● (9:00 p.m.)

Then there is family travel. If you live in the Maritimes or in one of the four western provinces and have kids and are moving them back and forth, do you not incur expenses? Was any member of the House, for instance, able to sneak away with a travel bill that was less than \$1,200 by the time he accounted for air fares or rail berths, taxis, overnight stops in hotels or motels and all those things that go toward moving a family across Canada? If those have been your expenses for those kinds of items alone, if you have spent about \$1,200 on them, you will know how much you have left to take care of every kind of expense that you can possibly imagine, out of an expense allowance of \$6,000.

One can see that this expense allowance in itself is hardly adequate. I do not think that even the *Globe and Mail* in its wildest dream can imagine that that is an adequate way of dealing with a Member of Parliament. In many cases members are living on other income as well as their parliamentary income in order to stay here. I ask, are we getting good representation when we ask people to come here and of their own charity serve the people of Canada? I do not think the people want us to do that.

Another point to observe is that there is virtually nothing left in this kind of expense allowance for any service at all in the members' riding. There is nothing left with which a member, could hire transportation which in a remote riding would enable him to get out to villages and communities he had never seen before. That would bring him in greater contact with his people, enable him to be a better Member of Parliament and make this place more representative of the people of Canada. But the expense allowance does not provide for that. It hardly provides for the kinds of essential expenses that members incur. Thus, in the illustration I have given, the increase of the expense allowance to \$8,000 will permit a member to meet his personal expenses and to have a little left for service to his riding. What is wrong with that?