

**Hon. Mr. Reid:** I think not, but of course the leader of the Labour Party has not always been a former Prime Minister. The present leader of that party in the United Kingdom happens to be a former Prime Minister, but if a new leader came along, as well one might, he would receive only a salary of £2,000.

Perhaps I stand alone in my thinking on this, but I wanted to take this occasion to suggest to honourable senators that if the ministers' motor car allowance is to be retained, and the salary increased the proposed scale as well, then let it be done decently; and instead of saying that they are to be paid \$15,000 yearly, let us state the amount as \$17,000. At present this \$2,000 motor car allowance is a hidden gift and, furthermore, it is tax free. I would like to see us above-board on the facts.

I am not in favour of paying the Leader of the Opposition the same salary as is paid to a cabinet minister. And I am still of the opinion that a cabinet minister's salary is too close to that of the Prime Minister who, after all, holds the key position in parliament, occupying as he does the highest position in political life in this country. Those remarks of mine would apply to anyone who is Prime Minister of the country. I do not know if anything will be done about it: in fact, I doubt if anything will, but still I raise my voice in protest against this item.

**Hon. John T. Haig:** Honourable senators, I do not intend to speak on the bill, but I challenge the statement of the honourable member for New Westminster (Hon. Mr. Reid) that the Leader of the Opposition in the other place, no matter who he may be, is not entitled to receive the same remuneration as a cabinet minister. The Leader of the Opposition in the other place holds the most important position in Canada, outside that of the Prime Minister. He is a man who could possibly be Prime Minister. Nobody is under such close scrutiny as is the Leader of the Opposition. He cannot carry on any private business while holding that position.

I remember that in 1927, after the appointment of the late Right Honourable R. B. Bennett as leader of the Conservative party, I drove with him up Portage Avenue in Winnipeg. On that occasion Mr. Bennett told me that he had sold all stocks he owned in every company he was interested in because, as he said, he wanted to be able to stand up in the house and say he did not own stock in any company. At that time I thought he was a perfect jackass to do that,

because the prices of stocks were rising. But apparently he was right, though I did not know it.

However, the point is that, under our system of government, the Leader of the Opposition does a magnificent work for this country. Some people may say that the present Leader of the Opposition is not as competent as the present Prime Minister. That is a matter of opinion, of course. The office demands that a man give his full time in service to it; and I venture again to say that, excepting the Prime Minister, and maybe not excluding even him, the Leader of the Opposition spends more time on public affairs than any other member of parliament. His time is fully occupied with the onerous duties of his office, for even if he did not feel inclined to perform them, party members would compel him to do so. I think Sir Wilfrid Laurier was the first Leader of the Opposition to be paid a salary. As a young man at that time I thought it was a move in the right direction, because I am sure it made him feel that he was an integral part of the parliamentary life of this country.

**Hon. Norman P. Lambert:** Honourable senators, I should like to point out that the question raised by the honourable senator from New Westminster (Hon. Mr. Reid) regarding the \$2,000 motor car allowance is not referred to in this bill and could be eliminated at any time without an act of parliament. The honourable member is quite within his rights in calling attention to this item. It is a good thing, I think, to have members in this house who do see the flies in the ointment occasionally. I think, however, that on this occasion, emphasis has to be placed in another direction. Living in Ottawa as I do, I have for some time been fairly close, in an intimate way, to ministers administering the affairs of this country; and I often wonder if our people really have an adequate understanding or appreciation of the time and the study that ministers devote to public affairs. For them there is no prescribed limit to the daily hours of work or number of days per week during which they must devote themselves to the service of the people. They are on the job all the time.

**Hon. Mr. Barbour:** They do not come under the labour code.

**Hon. Mr. Lambert:** No. If one had the time and inclination one could cite many occasions when ministers, on their own initiative and possibly without consultation with their colleagues, have taken action on what they