

**Hon. Mr. Euler:** Is that salary not lower than the salaries paid to a number of deputy ministers?

**Hon. Mr. Macdonald:** Yes, my information is that in many instances the deputy minister's salary at present is higher than that of the minister. I believe it is correct to say that in certain instances that disparity will prevail even when the minister's salary has been increased to \$15,000.

As honourable senators know, practically every person in Canada has received an increase in salary since 1920. The proposed increase is 50 per cent, and I doubt if there are many people in Canada whose salaries today are not 50 per cent higher than what they received in 1920.

One of the purposes of this bill, as the honourable senator from Waterloo (Hon. Mr. Euler) has implied, is to try to bring about a reasonable relationship between the remuneration of deputy ministers and that of the heads of the departments. I think another purpose of the bill—and I believe this has been expressed—is to bring the salaries of ministers somewhere in line with those received by senior executives in other occupations throughout Canada.

I leave the matter with honourable senators, merely repeating that the salaries of ministers of the crown have not changed since 1920, and now, after 34 years, it is proposed to increase the amount by 50 per cent.

**Some Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Aithur W. Roebuck:** Honourable senators, I think it should be pointed out that in actual fact the proposed increase is only a partial increase in respect of its buying power today. The Leader of the Government (Hon. Mr. Macdonald) has said that in the early years after confederation the Prime Minister and the other ministers of the crown each received \$5,000, which at that time was a lot of money.

**Hon. Mr. Euler:** And there was no income tax to pay on it.

**Hon. Mr. Roebuck:** Not only was there no income tax, but the standard of living then was much different from that of today. No automobiles, not even a Ford, could be bought at that time; and the only method of transportation, until the railways were available, was by horse and cart. Further, the cost of the upkeep of a family today is far different from what it was in those days, because there are more things the family of today demands and should have. If we go back only thirty or forty years and compare

the purchasing power of the dollar then with what it is today, we shall readily see that an increase in salary, numerically speaking, may not mean an increase in purchasing power.

It is absolutely necessary for the dignity of the country that the men who represent us in high office should be able to live on a standard comparable to that of men in similar positions in other countries. They should not be in such a plight as that described as his own by the present Minister of Finance, when speaking in another place a few days ago. I am thoroughly in accord with this decent and self-respecting act that we are now doing, that of giving the men who run this great country and spend the billions of dollars raised from the taxpayers a sum sufficient to maintain themselves in a standard of living which they ought to enjoy.

**Hon. Thomas Reid:** Honourable senators, with the remarks made by the last speaker I am quite in agreement. However, there are one or two things I should like to mention. May I first say that I had a particular reason for asking the honourable leader a question about the Prime Minister and other ministers of Great Britain.

As I followed the discussion on this legislation in the other place, it was apparent, as it often is, that all the details were not brought out. In dealing with this question of salaries for the Prime Minister and other ministers, I think the complete picture should be placed before parliament and the public generally.

I prefer the scale of payment of compensations in Great Britain where the Prime Minister stands high and is paid two and a half times as much as any other cabinet minister. Why should that not be so? The key figure in the entire political system is the Prime Minister. The British Prime Minister gets £10,000, and the rate for the other cabinet ministers is £4,000. But not all ministers receive that sum, for it is recognized that some portfolios are not as heavy as others. I am not suggesting that Canada should adopt the same differential as Great Britain has, because I realize how difficult it would be for a Prime Minister to make distinction between the responsibilities of cabinet ministers, from a pay standpoint. Nevertheless, we all know that in this country some government posts are more onerous than others.

I am about to make a suggestion affecting the compensation of cabinet ministers, though I am fully aware that once a custom has been established any remarks of mine are unlikely to change it. Having protested against the