Members' Salaries

escalator; whether it is a proper one or not will be for the committee to decide when the bill goes to committee.

Having said that, I come back to the proposition that I first made. Although we should seek guidance from some committee not constituted by members of parliament, and also have reference to some indices or escalators, we cannot dissociate ourselves from the ultimate responsibility vis-à-vis any salary increase. In the final analysis, the government must introduce a bill and it cannot avoid responsibility for bringing forward a bill. As the government House leader said, it does so on the basis of recommendations made to the government. The government is always getting recommendations made to it and it legislates upon the basis of its appreciation of those recommendations. Sometimes these recommendations are changed to reflect the government's view of what it feels is the proper course to take.

As the government cannot escape its responsibility, so cannot we. No matter what outside advice we receive, ultimately a bill must come before this parliament and this parliament must approve it, reject it or amend it. I fervently hope that whatever bill is finally passed will have attached to it some sensible, realistic method for the making of salary recommendations by a body outside the House.

I have really concluded what I wanted to say, Madam Speaker, except for this. We are faced here with a vexing, difficult and contentious problem, that of how to persuade people to come to this House or to become members of legislatures and do the job that they should do. All over the world the light of freedom is flickering in face of the strong winds of violence and intimidation, of attempts to secure a government of the people by other than democratic means. Let us not delude ourselves. We are not necessarily free from that possibility. Governments become stronger, more powerful, more capable of shaping the lives and fortunes and the social mores of the people they govern.

Through you, Madam Speaker, I say to the members of the House and to the people of Canada that it is imperative that we have in this House a continuing inflow of people—hopefully, young people. I am not necessarily a worshipper at the altar of youth, but I have discovered that you have to be here a number of years to find out the difference between a messenger and a member of the other place, as the case may be; and I do not say that disrespectfully. But we cannot hope to retain the virtues of freedom that we have unless we interpose between the people and the government of this country a strong, resolute and determined body, whether in the legislature of a province or in the Parliament of Canada.

We must say to young people of knowledge and competence, men and women from all classes of society, "Come to us; we need you. We need your help to retain the virtues that we have developed in Canada over a great many years". It is all very well to talk about being patriotic and about putting aside the question of money, but this is a materialistic world and people must have the freedom of independence to stand up for the things in which they believe and, I would hope, to stand up to the government. I hope this measure will provide the incentive to govern-

ment members to stand up to the government from time to time.

• (1640)

I repeat what I said the other day, that I see at long last some indication that this government is finally moving toward some recognition of the fact that private members in this House should have opportunities to ascertain the views of the people and bring forward intelligent and rational ideas, and that all the wisdom of humanity does not lie within the four corners of the cabinet and the top members of the civil service. I would suggest that if and when this measure is completed and the process initiated by the government continues, as we will press for it, this will mean the House will have some opportunity to speak on behalf of the people of Canada, and more frequently against the government if need be. For these reasons, I intend to vote for the bill.

Mr. Edward Broadbent: Madam Speaker, in rising to take part in the debate this afternoon I want to make a number of serious and, I think, reasonable points on the issues involved. Following my comments I intend, on behalf of my party, to move an amendment to the motion before us. Before doing so I should like to clarify once and for all the issue raised by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), government spokesmen and the government House leader more than once and referred to just a few minutes ago by the House leader of the Conservative Party, namely, the consultation process that presumably has gone on in order to get to the point we are at this afternoon in the House—debate on this bill brought in by the government.

Had the government been serious about all-party consultations, this proposal should have been presented during the regular meetings of the party House leaders. If the government House leader had wanted a serious response from this and other parties, he should have brought this proposal before the regular meetings of the House leaders of all parties. Then in due course the proposal would have been put to the NDP caucus and, presumably, before the other parties' caucuses. Had that been done, the same kind of agreement might have been reached that is often reached on other matters.

I suggest that process was not followed, because if it had been the government would have to accept a more clear line of responsibility for what it has presented to the House. The government, the Prime Minister and the cabinet then could not fob off on the members of the House and, more particularly, on the people of Canada the argument that it is really responding to pressures put on it by the poor, lowly MPs and it cannot really be held responsible for what it is doing. I say that the government has erred in a serious way in not following through with its responsibilities, if it wanted to do something like this, by bringing it to the House leaders and the various party caucuses for serious discussion. The government knows very well, I would suggest, that what it really wanted to do was sneak this measure in by the back door as quickly as possible.

Some hon. Members: Oh. oh!