

demand for all those blackboards would be. And what a profit the paint manufacturers would make.

Honourable senators, I do not want to take too much time. I come now to the climax of the story. I wonder, honourable senators, if you are interested in my speech. I do not see anyone dozing now, and that is the greatest comfort that I have. If you want to listen to my story I will unfold it before your eyes. No, I will unfold it so that you will hear it—I cannot unfold it before your eyes because my paper supply is limited.

In the *Minutes of the Proceedings* of last session I found something that was not offensive to any senator, the tenth report of the Standing Committee on Internal Economy and Contingent accounts, dated August 1, 1956, which reads as follows:

Your committee recommend that the usual supply of stationery, etc., which has been selected by your committee with due regard to usefulness and economy, for use of the senators in their rooms and desks in the Senate chamber, be supplied according to the lists approved by your committee and deposited with the Clerk of Stationery, and that the distribution be made in a way similar to that of the present session.

The report concludes by saying:

On motion of the Honourable Senator Macdonald, P.C., seconded by the Honourable Senator Godbout, it was—

Ordered, That the said report be taken into consideration to-morrow.

There is nothing wrong with that. This is why I was permitted to speak graciously of the committee at the outset of this session, on January 16. All I found on August 2 was the fact that the Senate presented for consideration this report. Now, what surprised me was that on January 18 I received in my mail a letter, reading as follows:

Room 530, The Senate

Dear Sir:

At the 1956 annual meeting of the Subcommittee on Stationery, a recommendation was forwarded to the Internal Economy Committee "that each honourable senator's stationery account be limited to the sum of \$30.00 per annum, with the exceptions of the offices of the Speaker of the Senate, and the Leader of the Government in the Senate and the Leader of the Opposition in the Senate. There would, however, be no limitation in the case of a newly-appointed senator during his or her first year in office, in order that all his or her basic requirements might thus be obtained.

Furthermore, when the above mentioned quota has been reached, that the Chief of the Stationery Branch be instructed to forward a circular letter to honourable senators, requesting their co-operation in limiting their requests to this figure".

This recommendation was subsequently approved by the Internal Economy Committee.

Your attention is kindly directed to the foregoing, together with the advice that your current year's account now stands at—\$52.78.

Robert Lay, (chief)
Stationery Branch.

That is the pleasant letter which rewarded me for my gracious speech. Immediately after I made that speech I received that letter, and the first thing that I did was to go to the office of the Leader of the Government (Hon. Mr. Macdonald) to ask him if he had a copy of the report of the Subcommittee on Stationery. He had none. Then I went next door to the office of our good friend the Clerk of the Senate. He had none. I asked the honourable senator from Ottawa West (Hon. J. J. Connolly) if he had a copy. He was in his office in town, and he told me that perhaps he had one, but he could not remember definitely. Next I asked the chairman of the subcommittee, the honourable gentleman from Blaine Lake (Hon. Mr. Horner), if he had a copy, and he did not. Finally I went to the office of the clerk of the committee, and he went through the file; there was no report of the subcommittee. I was surprised, it was a mysterious affair. I wanted to know, and I asked questions. Those questions were answered today, but the answers are still unknown to all of us, even to you, Mr. Speaker.

I am not in the secret of the gods. I was offended. I said in the first place that this man calls himself the chief of the branch, yet he is alone in the branch. He reminds me of Armand Lavergne, who said of Mr. Bourassa when they were sitting alone in the Quebec Legislative Assembly, "He is my leader and I am his party." However, they were two, but this man is alone. Yet he calls himself the chief of the branch. Not only that, but in that most important book, the Government of Canada Telephone Directory, he calls himself "Chief of Div"—divisional chief of the stationery branch—which I find impudent.

My contention is, honourable senators, that we are not to be written bold letters by any civil servant. Moreover, no senator has the right to impose a limitation on the work of any member of this house. It is not done in the House of Commons. Why should it be done in the Senate?

Speaking of a sense of proportion, I enjoy very much reading a book that nobody else reads; it is a fascinating book, more interesting than any best seller. I refer to the Estimates. What do I find there? One thing that I find is what was spent for paper last year in the various branches and departments of government. For instance, the Senate's appropriation, including the three above mentioned gentlemen and all branches of the Senate, was \$7,000. The amount spent in the House of Commons was \$70,000, some ten times that of the Senate. I know that the members of the House of Commons have more correspondence than we have, but there