

ister. Sixteen years ago the salary of the highest paid deputy minister, which was \$20,000, caught up with the salary of the Auditor General. Six years ago the salary of the Auditor General was \$30,000 and the salary of the highest paid deputy minister was \$29,160. The salaries were almost identical. At the present time, the government has succeeded in hiding many figures with relation to the salaries of deputy ministers and it is very difficult to secure this information.

Since 1967, the government has failed to initiate a salary adjustment for the Auditor General, although the salaries of senior deputy ministers have been increased by \$2,000 effective January 1, 1967, \$7,000 effective January 1, 1969 and \$2,000 effective January 1, 1970. Apparently these salaries are to be increased by \$5,000 effective January 1, 1971 and \$5,000 effective January 1, 1972 to a maximum of \$50,000 per annum.

There are two aspects of this which concern me. I think the limiting of the salary of the Auditor General to the amount fixed by the bill is an indication that there is still, with regard to the present holder of that office, the feeling of dislike which we have seen so evident here in the past. I do not wish to go into that. I hope it will not be necessary to do so. However, I am sure that is a conclusion one is entitled to draw from the facts. I must also point out that the obvious decrease in the importance of the office of the Auditor General in the mind of the government compared to the premium it places upon the offices of various senior deputy ministers give me cause for concern. This is certainly indicated by these salary adjustments.

The Auditor General, who at one time received a salary higher than Canada's senior deputy ministers, will now be substantially below them. He must meet them in his operations on even terms. Certainly, the question of salary does not prohibit the present incumbent of the office doing this. I do not think there would be any problem in this regard. However, I wonder what might happen when, after a year or two, there is a new Auditor General. We might consider what will be the nature of his office, the terms of his employment and his approach to the duties which have been attached to the office under our Financial Administration Act, which permit him to act as one of the great buffers between the taxpayers of this country and the spending proclivities of this government. I call this to the attention of the Parliamentary Secretary.

Secondly, there will be a very substantial effect on the pension of the present incumbent because on April 26, 1971, as recorded at page 5211 of *Hansard*, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) gave notice of the government's intention to introduce legislation to increase the salary of the Auditor General by equating his salary to that of the Chief Justice of the Federal Court of Canada. However, on retirement judges may be granted pensions of up to two-thirds of their final salary, whereas the provision with regard to the pension of the Auditor General, based as it is in respect of other civil servants on the last six years of service, would not be an equation of pension and would certainly create a substantial distinction between

Judges and Financial Administration Acts

the pension of the Auditor General and of the judicial officers concerned. It would be possible for the government to go a step further and equate the salary and pension of the Auditor General with that of the Chief Justice of the Federal Court of Canada. I simply leave it at that. I hope that what at one time appeared to be a very serious vendetta in this regard on the part of the government has now been dissipated, and that the government will indicate this by examining the proposal I have made before this bill comes back to the House.

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, I can be exceedingly brief in my discussion, particularly since the previous speaker indicated we probably will not have too much to do with the making of regulations.

Mr. Whicher: Neither one of you—

Mr. Peters: The hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Whicher) says that neither one of us will have many opportunities in this regard. Let me say to the hon. member for Bruce that this is a subject which comes up annually, and sometimes two and three times in one year. The judges are being very well looked after by the present government. I was about to say I have no interest in this matter from the point of view of the appointments. I do not have any particular interest in who is appointed. Over the years, however, I have found that the fact we pay the money does not necessarily mean we get the type of judges this country deserves or wants. There is still prevalent in this country an attitude on the part of the judiciary that property is more important than people. For this reason, I can probably support the argument of the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis) that the amount of money will not ensure the type of judiciary we all desire.

I am not sure the reverse would be true either. I am not sure it would be true that we could have a qualified judiciary that was based on a very low standard of income. When a lawyer is well aware of the fact that he could earn \$40,000, \$50,000 or \$60,000 a year as a lawyer, there would be no reason for him to take an appointment to the bench at \$30,000. So, there is a great responsibility on the government in the appointment of the judiciary to ensure that there is a high degree of quality in those who sit on the bench for the benefit of all those who appear in court. For this reason, I am in favour of seeing that the judges have a very reasonable salary and that they do not have to do the things judges in the past sometimes have had to do, such as taking on outside work, thereby finding themselves in the position of making decisions which eventually come back to haunt them in their judicial practice.

From reading the bill, Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to tell whether the Chief Justice of Canada will receive \$47,000 or \$50,000 because Clause 20 indicates that there will be an increase of from \$2,000 to \$3,000. I presume this will be in salary. It is to repay the judge for doing some things not normally in the judicial field. I have been pleased to see over the past few years that the government has shown some concern and has made some