

of Representatives in the United States. I think it is noteworthy that the salaries of senators and members of the House of Representatives in the United States are considerably higher than those provided in this bill.

Honourable senators, the Government considers, in the light of all circumstances, that the provisions of this bill deserve the support of this chamber. I commend this bill to honourable senators.

Hon. Mr. Flynn: Honourable senators, I move the adjournment of the debate.

The Hon. the Speaker: I understand that the honourable Senator Lawson has indicated that he wishes to speak.

Hon. Edward M. Lawson: Honourable senators, I should like to make a few brief comments on the proposed legislation. I recognize the delicacy involved in such a matter but, having spent a goodly number of years negotiating contracts and wage increases for many walks of life in many parts of the country, having been on record long before I was appointed to this chamber in support of adjustments for elected and appointed officials of our Government, I think I am entitled to make a few comments.

I am somewhat concerned with the criticism flowing so easily from the press. Some of it concerns the inflationary aspect, but I wonder whether when the press directs comment regarding inflationary aspects the rule of clean hands should not apply?

I took the precaution of checking what the newspapers have done in the same period, from 1963. I think it is fair to say that newspaper owners are not generally regarded as being overly generous with their money in paying their employees. In 1963 they gave an increase of 3.7 per cent; in 1964, 3.6 per cent; in 1965, 3.4 per cent; in 1966, 3.3 per cent; in 1967, 9 per cent; in 1968, 7 per cent; in 1969, 9.1 per cent, and so on. Therefore, in the same period in which they describe this as being inflationary, the total increase given to newspaper employees was approximately 58 per cent. I do not consider it to have been too high an increase to their employees during the course of that time. It was a fair one. However, surely if they are to describe the increase that is proposed for elected and appointed legislators as being inflationary, the rule of clean hands should apply.

In 1963 when the newspapers gave their employees an increase of 3.7 per cent, or in 1969 when they gave them an increase of 9.1 per cent, had they also editorialized that similar increases be paid to members and senators, I would have had a better regard for their credibility and right to criticize at this time. Members of Parliament are certainly not overpaid. They earn every nickel they are paid. And coming from British Columbia and being aware of the vastness of Canada and the miles to be travelled, I say it is sheer nonsense to suggest that members make money on their expense accounts. Then, of course, those who come here from British Columbia, have the additional expense of buying winter clothes.

[Hon. Mr. Martin.]

It always troubles me that when increases are proposed, emotions become involved and the issues are lost sight of. I was pleased that the Beaupré Committee took particular note that it was a constitutional responsibility for members of Parliament to serve their constituents at a cost which, they being elected representatives, should be reimbursed.

The question of retroactivity was raised. I know of no contract in my experience negotiated for truck drivers and other classifications that did not contain a condition that the terms of the contract were retroactive to its first day. There is ample precedent for the same situation to apply to increases for elected and appointed legislators. I see no validity in the suggestion that the increase is retroactive to 1963 and that former members of both houses will be paid. That criticism has no validity unless it were suggested that the retroactivity would apply to those persons who have left both chambers. The application of retroactive pay to the beginning of the session is proper, and this principle is practised throughout labour-management negotiations in all parts of the country.

The judiciary are not affected by this bill, but I was on record some years ago regarding this question. The Canadian people, who have the benefit of an excellent judicial system, take this for granted. We demand the highest standard, and yet we seem to ignore our responsibility to see that in return the members of the judiciary are properly reimbursed. Despite a heavy workload and poor working conditions as far as court houses are concerned, our judges give a high standard of service.

There appears to be some sensitivity about this legislation as it affects senators. I must confess I do not share in this. I have not been here long enough, I think, to be described by those who criticize us as a fixed part of the establishment, but I have been here long enough to be objective. What I was told I was going to see and what I have observed myself are two entirely different things. I see a Government Leader of the Senate (Hon. Mr. Martin) carrying a tremendous workload, and I have known places where wildcat strikes have been called because of far less tough conditions. We have a Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Mr. Flynn) who takes his duties very seriously and discharges them very well.

I look around me and see many honourable senators displaying the kind of competence that in private life would earn for them many many times in excess of what they are paid. They give of their time, and make this contribution freely. There is no need for any delicacy or apology for the contribution being made by this chamber. I have observed the committees, which may not be as flamboyant or so covered by television as those of other governments, but the type of work done by these committees, the calibre of questioning and the quality of reports need not be apologized for by any member of this chamber to anyone anywhere.

I am concerned that there is not more provision for an annual review for elected and appointed officials, whether it is tied to senior civil servants or some level of top management. Surely, other than the people themselves, is