

*Supply—Lieutenant Governors*

people of Canada tonight. The amount proposed, \$21,500 is not significant; but does it not indicate to parliament that we are not getting very far in cutting down non-essential expenditures? I do not think the taxpayers of Canada, who are being called upon to submit to a budget approximating \$5 billion this year, are going to approve of expenditures of this kind for hospitality. I believe if a Gallup poll were taken right across this country 95 per cent of the taxpayers would be opposed to it. Some years ago my own province abolished the official residence, and I am quite sure the government would be pleased if there were no lieutenant governor at all and the chief justice performed the various functions required. I suggest to the government that if they did away with these posts altogether and let the chief justices carry on they could save about \$225,000 in salaries and expenses. For the government to propose an expenditure of this kind tonight I say is almost scandalous.

**Mr. St. Laurent:** The reason for bringing it forward at this time is that on the occasion of the royal visit it was brought forcibly to the attention of the Canadian public that there were expenses of this kind that it was proper and dignified for the Canadian people to provide.

**Mr. Macdonnell (Greenwood):** The Prime Minister has presented a very persuasive argument in support of this item. I only regret that this argument was not presented when the item first came up. But I put it to the Prime Minister that there is still the question of the way this is being done. This is not the first time this has happened today; and I ask the Prime Minister whether it would not be fairer to the house if this were brought in not at the tail end of the supplementary estimates on the last day of the year, when we are in a hurry to get things done, but rather in the ordinary course as an amendment to the statute. I am quite sure no one in this house wishes to be cheese-paring or niggardly in dealing with the representative of the queen, but I do venture to ask the Prime Minister whether it would not be fairer to this house to have this done not in this indirect way but in the direct way.

**Mr. St. Laurent:** If it were done in the direct way, Mr. Chairman, there would be at least six occasions for debate upon it. There would be the resolution stage, the three readings of the bill and so on. If we were to attempt to do all these little things by means of bills requiring a resolution, we would not be able to have one session per year as the constitution requires; it would take several years to have a session.

[Mr. Thatcher.]

**Mr. Knowles:** I am amazed that the Prime Minister should seriously tell the house that things are being done in this way to avoid the recognized procedure of bringing in bills and putting them through the stages that are required by the rules of this house.

**Mr. St. Laurent:** This is merely an item that has to be voted by the house to cover some expenditures, and the regular way to do that is by an item in the estimates. The difference is that it will have to be voted every time it is to be paid, while if we amended the statute it would then become a charge upon the consolidated revenue fund. That is the only difference. This is to cover something which we regard—perhaps we may be mistaken—as something properly to be covered out of public funds, that is to say these necessary travelling and hospitality expenses that have to be incurred by gentlemen who are appointed by the federal government and for whom by the constitution the federal government is responsible.

Amendment (Mr. Knowles) negatived: Yeas, 8; nays, 81.

Item agreed to.

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

563. Compensation for animals slaughtered under the Animal Contagious Diseases Act; and additional compensation in conformity with the terms of the act for the control and extirpation of foot-and-mouth disease—further amount required, \$665,000.

**Mr. Ross (Souris):** This item was the first called on Friday, and it stood over because the minister and his assistant were not in the house at that time. During the evening the minister came into the house and made the following statement:

Mr. Chairman, on a question of privilege, I have had an opportunity to read over the debates of this afternoon. On a number of occasions reference was made to the fact that neither I nor my assistant was here. My assistant went home yesterday sick. He is in bed sick at home. That is the only reason he is not here. This afternoon at four o'clock I was presented with the report of the board of Regina which is making decisions on what money should be paid to the individual farmers, the complete report, and I spent the afternoon going over that report. The work is not completed simply because I had to come into the house tonight and sit here and wait for this item. I have been waiting here now for it for an hour and a half.

Mr. Chairman, when the minister first came in my colleague the member for Greenwood suggested that we might then discuss the item. The Minister of Finance said, no, we would proceed with the list and deal with this item at some later time.