

refurnishing of the quarters of the Governor General in the Quebec citadel. The work is of a miscellaneous character and consists of the entire renovation of the existing building, which was erected about a century ago and was in a very bad state of repair, part of it practically gone to decay. The work to be undertaken during the year is of two kinds: Renovation and alterations such as renewal of floors, window panes, sashes, doors, alterations to stairs, new plumbing, new roofing, alterations to the heating plant, painting and replastering. This is estimated to cost \$80,000.

Mr. GEARY: Outside of that the building is all right?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Outside of that the building is as good as any building a hundred years old. The balance of the amount, \$70,000, is for furnishing such as carpets, draperies, furniture and so on. It means almost a complete refurnishing of the quarters.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Where did former governors general go?

Mr. ELLIOTT: To the same place.

Mr. CANNON: But not since 1915 or 1916.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Quebec citadel—Governor General's quarters—additions, alterations and improvements, \$150,000.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Mr. Chairman, when the committee rose at six o'clock I was asking the minister for some information in respect to this vote. Was the money spent that was voted last year, and what commitments, if any, have we in respect of this vote of \$150,000.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The money voted last year is practically all spent. Certain further work has been proceeded with, on account of its being urgent, and the desire to have the alterations and improvements completed by next June.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Then part of the money which we propose to vote now has been already spent?

Mr. ELLIOTT: We are practically committed to it, subject to its being voted by the house.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I do not know just what sort of bug gets into the minds of ministers when they set out to spend money on a proposition of this kind. We have one official

residence for the governor general; now we are to have another house at Quebec, and I hear rumours around the house that there is one proposed on the west coast, at Vancouver or somewhere in British Columbia. Where is this thing going to end? For my part I have not spoken to the ministers regarding any appropriation in my county, neither last year nor the year before, although I could point out to many places both in my county and in the adjoining county where it is necessary to spend money. Although there are hundreds of constituencies where the expenditure of money is necessary in the interests of the public service, we are met here with an unnecessary and unwarranted expenditure, and I for one object to it.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I should like to add my protest against the expenditure for this purpose. I quite concede that something should be done to maintain the citadel at Quebec. I remember a few years ago visiting it and noting with some regret that the old walls were in a very bad condition. I was shown the governor general's room there, and undoubtedly it was not a fit place in which to place the governor general. But why is it necessary to erect new residence for him at the citadel? There is a chateau there in which he can be very well provided for. He has his own private cars—about which perhaps we may have an opportunity of hearing something a little bit later—and in these very frequently he can remain with a good deal of comfort. It seems to me we are simply copying some of the least desirable practices of Great Britain, where the king has castles and houses here and there across the country. The governor general will more and more, become, as I understand it from the constitutional standpoint, purely the representative of the king in Canada, and I do not see why we should attempt to provide for a style of living, in respect to the governor general's quarters that is not in conformity with the ideals of the vast majority of the Canadian people. We do not need to set up a kind of semi-feudalism in this country. As has been said, there are a very large number of perfectly legitimate expenditures of which we stand in great need. I fancy we shall be told before very long that we cannot possibly put into operation such a scheme as unemployment insurance because we have not the funds at our disposal. We are told again and again that certain items are being cut down—items which are very necessary, involving expenditures which would really help the people—because we must preserve the