

Ontario, has, we all know, a beautiful Government House, on the banks of the St. Lawrence. I have attended a number of splendid functions there. I am a strong believer in the maintenance of our connection with the Motherland, and I think that His Majesty's representatives at Ottawa and in the provincial capitals should each be paid an adequate salary and furnished with an appropriate residence where distinguished visitors can be entertained.

I wish to say a few words about pensions. As the honourable leader of the government (Hon. Mr. Robertson) remarked, our ideas change. In 1905 I was one of a group working hard in a printing office for low wages. We thought it was prudent to save what little we could as a protection against the inevitable day when we could no longer work, but we never dreamed of pensions. In the meantime, and especially during the last ten years, the public have become pension conscious. From my connection with a number of organizations I have learned that people today are in favour of pension plans, particularly plans to which they can contribute.

As to pensions for cabinet ministers, I am in favour of the general idea, though I can see a good many difficulties in the way. For instance, a man can enter the cabinet on the invitation of the Prime Minister to become one of his councillors, and if at any time it is felt that the services of that member are no longer desirable his resignation can be asked for. It would seem to me, therefore, that some minimum term of service should be necessary before ministers became eligible for pensions. I do not know what term might be suggested.

Hon. Mr. QUINN: The Act of 1905 stipulated five years.

Hon. Mr. DAVIES: That does not seem to be long enough; perhaps ten years would be better, although of course some governments do not last that length of time.

However, as I have said, I am in favour of the general principle of pensions. Most of us in this house have lived long enough to have found that nothing is harder to guess accurately than the amount of a certain person's wealth. Too often, I am afraid, we have discovered that men who served the country well have died much poorer than we thought they were. I recall that many years ago, after the death of a man who had long and ably filled a prominent office in the province of Ontario, a subscription had to be taken up for his widow. Here is another instance. A Dominion cabinet minister was generally supposed to be wealthy; but when he died a settlement at so much on the dollar had to

be arranged with his creditors. That was told to me in amazement by a friend of mine, the president of the trust company which handled the estate. We have to recognize that these things happen. A man occupying high public office may have little time to look after his personal interests, and at the end of ten or fifteen years of service his estate may be small.

I believe the time has come when every man and woman in this rich country should be able to look forward to an old age free from financial worries. I do not think our old age pension rates today are high enough. Of course, any worth-while increase in the rates would raise the cost to the country by millions of dollars, and we all want lower taxes. Nevertheless, I feel that better provision should be made for our elderly people. We know that many persons, owing to circumstances beyond their control, have been able to put aside but little of this world's goods for their old age. This is particularly true of hard-working men and women who have struggled to give their children a good education, a better start in life than they themselves had. Only last week my attention was drawn to the case of a man and his wife who had put four children through university, and who now, when past sixty, are wondering what is to become of themselves.

I shall support any reasonable scheme of pensions for cabinet ministers who have served a certain minimum length of time. And I hope that next session all the lieutenant-governors will be given an increase in salary.

Hon. FELIX P. QUINN: Honourable senators, I had hoped that when suggesting increased salaries the leader of the government (Hon. Mr. Robertson) and the honourable gentleman from Kingston (Hon. Mr. Davies) would have mentioned one particular public office which I am sure we all agree is entitled to some consideration in this report. I refer to the high and responsible position of Prime Minister of Canada, for which the salary is \$15,000 a year. I doubt if any other country comparable to Canada pays its leading statesman such a paltry sum. As honourable members of another place might feel some delicacy in moving to have this matter considered, I suggest it is not only our right, but our duty, to initiate consideration of it in the Senate. I therefore suggest that a bill to increase the Prime Minister's salary should be introduced here next session. The Prime Minister of Canada should receive \$50,000 a year. He should get at least as much as the Governor-General, whose stipend is fixed at £10,000.

I bring these matters to the attention of the house and ask the leader of the government to consider them.