

amount set up in another place in 1931, for compensation in lieu of a motor car for cabinet ministers, I have waited a long time for an opportunity to renew my protest. My particular criticism is as to the \$2,000 motor car allowance. I was in the other house when this subject was first introduced, and I am familiar with the story behind it. There was good justification for the then Prime Minister, the late Lord Bennett, to make the change he did, namely, to sell all ministerial motor cars and provide a yearly allowance of \$2,000 for each minister. The fact, however, was that before this arrangement conditions had almost amounted to a scandal. Certain cabinet ministers were taking the car and chauffeur assigned to them almost around the world, at the expense of this country. But while the then Prime Minister changed the arrangement as to motor cars, human nature, it seems, did not change. If one looked into the details of the administration of that day, he might find out that although \$2,000 was allowed to ministers for their motor car and chauffeur, the amount charged for the use of taxicabs was staggering. So it did not solve the problem of transportation costs.

What I want particularly to point out is that the motor car allowance was put in Appropriation Act No. 5 of 1931, as vote No. 352, and a similar vote has been made every year since. I shall read the vote:

To provide for payment annually from the Consolidated Revenue Fund of the sum of \$2,000 to each minister of the crown charged with the administration of a department, the Solicitor General, and the Leader of the Opposition, and the sum of \$1,000, each to the Speaker of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Commons, in lieu of motor cars and their maintenance, including chauffeurs, the acceptance of such sums not to vacate their respective seats in parliament: and to authorize the Governor in Council to appoint any person now employed in the public service as a chauffeur of a passenger automobile at Ottawa, whose position is abolished, to a vacant position in the public service, provided such chauffeur has been continuously employed as such for at least two years and that the appointment will be made at no higher remuneration than he is now receiving.

I am one of those who believe that the Prime Minister should be placed away above all other cabinet ministers. I believe he should have the finest automobile and the best looking chauffeur to take him around, all in keeping with the dignity of his high office. I prefer not to mention any names on the question of allowances to cabinet ministers, but I have known some who collected their \$2,000 for a motor car and chauffeur, but who had no car and no chauffeur, and every time they travelled by air or train they went at government expense. I am against the policy of handing out \$2,000 for something that is not used. The allowance, when it was made in 1931, was for a specific purpose. I spoke against the principle of the

allowance at that time, and I still believe that it should not be paid. The only opportunity I have had to raise the subject is under the Salaries Bill. I hope I am in order in doing so.

**Hon. Mr. Roebuck:** I think you are in order.

**Hon. Mr. Reid:** I know there are some who are fond of calling me out of order on the least provocation.

**Hon. Mr. Quinn:** Don't anticipate trouble.

**Hon. Mr. Reid:** I have no fear of trouble.

**Hon. Mr. Euler:** You have never run away from it.

**Hon. Mr. Reid:** I honestly believe the motor car allowance should be eliminated.

While I agree with the remarks of the honourable senator from Toronto-Trinity (Hon. Mr. Roebuck) as to salaries, I would prefer to compare the rate of pay of our Prime Minister, not with that of the President of the United States or the Prime Minister of Britain, but with that of men in high positions in business in Canada, who are paid as much as \$50,000 and \$70,000. The Prime Minister will receive an increased salary, but in my opinion it should be higher.

What I am wondering about, though, is why was it ever proposed to give the Leader of the Opposition in the other place a salary equivalent to that of a cabinet minister. I do not know of any reason for that proposal. We say little about it, except outside of parliament. We say, "Let it go." Some say that we, ourselves, have been given an increase of so much, so why should we worry? I criticize this increase to the Leader of the Opposition because the duties of his office are small compared with those of the Prime Minister or of any other cabinet minister.

**Hon. Mr. Quinn:** How do you know? You have never been Leader of the Opposition.

**Hon. Mr. Reid:** I have been in opposition, but I have never been leader. When we discuss these matters we often compare our parliamentary system to the British parliamentary system, and at other times we turn to the United States for a comparison. The Leader of the Opposition at Westminster is paid only half of what a cabinet minister receives. I think that Mr. Atlee, as leader of a large opposition party, is entitled to £2,000 yearly.

**Hon. Mr. Haig:** Does not the Leader of the Opposition in the United Kingdom parliament receive the same salary as a cabinet minister? I think the present leader receives the same salary as the Prime Minister.