

No such provision is contained in this bill except, as I understand it, that making the increase retroactive to the beginning of this Parliament.

● (2050)

So, while I do not begrudge any of these groups those very healthy increases, I really think that the rule of clean hands applies, and that journalists and editorialists have just as much responsibility in their field as we have in ours. They have a duty to say, "While we are attacking the government and members of both houses for this very large and exorbitant increase—which has now been reduced to 33½ per cent—we have only had the benefit of a 70 per cent increase ourselves." I think that instead of being on the defensive—and we have to assume some of the responsibility for being in this box—we should take the offensive and say to the Canadian public at large, "Yes, you are paying a fair wage, but you will be getting a good return on your investment, the investment you are making in the sacrifice of your public servants."

It is becoming even more difficult in British Columbia. The Leader of the Government pointed out some of the things that are taking place in that province. It is becoming difficult for industry and unions with their representatives to compete with the salaries paid by the provincial government. In this article I prepared I have some of them: Commissioners, \$34,000; Compensation Board, \$39,000; Associate Deputy Ministers, \$33,000; Labour Relations Board Deputy Minister, \$43,000, and so on. To my chagrin, the day the article came out it was obsolete because the provincial government raised all categories by an additional \$5,000.

But the thing that really troubles me about that is that at no time while this provincial government, this NDP government, was putting in these increases—and I do not begrudge them; I am not opposed to them—I did not hear one word of protest from the members opposing it in the other house. There was not a single word; there was absolute silence at raising the Premier of British Columbia to a higher scale than that of the Prime Minister of Canada. There was no protest against doubling the increases for members of the provincial house, and there was no protest against raising these various civil servants to an average of about \$40,000 a year. There was not one word of protest. Now if they want to oppose this increase on its merits, and if they are opposed to it, then all I can say is that they are truly the best judges of their own worth.

Honourable senators, I think we have an obligation to speak out. The Leader of the Government talked about the civil servants who are being paid well, but he failed to mention that there are more than 1,000 civil servants in this city alone earning in excess of \$60,000 a year. There is no word of protest about that, and it is more than double what is being paid to members of either house.

I think we should also put an end to the very invalid argument that Senator Perrault mentioned about the question of expenses, but again we will read tomorrow in every newspaper across the country articles relating and tying the expenses to our salaries. Coming from British Columbia, I know of no member of either house who is not spending 100 per cent of his expenses and more. I know of nobody in private industry or among union representa-

[Senator Lawson.]

tives who are getting only \$4,000 or \$8,000 tax free. The average in my office for representatives is \$15,000 a year tax free. We do not tally this as part of their salary; it relates to fares and travelling. Yes, we get 52 trips per year and 10 to other parts of the country, and there is some criticism because you are allowed to bring your spouse six times a year to Ottawa. I think that was occasioned when they allowed conjugal visits for prisoners once a week and they thought the senators could handle it six times a year.

I read an article last week which said that members of the Senate are going to get this substantial salary for working seven hours a day. Well, when Senator Perrault and I put in seven hours, we have not yet reached the Chamber. We are still on our way to the airport because, like our good friend from New Brunswick, we do not have a direct flight either. So, honourable senators, I think that at every opportunity we should point out, loud and clear, some of these issues.

I have also read criticisms about the parliamentary restaurant. I had dinner with some of our labour friends who were here from Whitehorse, trying to get a preview of what is going to happen when they get a member in the Senate. While we had dinner we talked about the low rate that one has to pay there. It is really a matter of comparison. When somebody asks, "How is your wife?" the reply is, "Compared to whose?" We pay \$2 for a meal, but when I worked on construction I got free room and board and did not pay anything. And this happens with most tradesmen across the country.

I do not mind honest and objective criticism, but surely we are entitled to demand of our friends in the press that it be honest and fair criticism.

What is happening with increases in wage negotiations? I am not even too proud to report it because the average increase in Canada for the last quarter of 1974 was 19.4 per cent. The average of the settlements made in the first quarter of this year, 1975, has been 15 per cent. So, while there is concern, and while there will be criticism levelled by the press at this increase over a four-year period of 33½ per cent, most organized unions will have received in the year 1974-1975 at least 34 or 35 per cent. A settlement was negotiated on Monday—Senator Perrault may be interested to know this—in Surrey after a strike of six or eight weeks. The union accepted the argument of the municipality that they could not afford any more, and so they accepted a "cheap deal" of 35 per cent plus a cost of living increase for two years.

Surely in the face of that—and I think there is a need, as a separate subject, for trade unions to concern themselves about these high increases—there is a need to concern ourselves with what is happening to less fortunate groups who do not have these recovery powers. When that is measured and compared with what is happening to people on fixed incomes in this chamber and in the House of Commons, and judges, I think we can stand any kind of scrutiny, as a fair comparison shows that no one here is being overpaid.

Speaking of the judges, I do not know when amendments to the Judges Act are coming in, but I hope that the government is going to introduce them quickly. While there are members of both houses, as Senator Perrault pointed out, who do not want to admit, out of a sense of