

## Supply—Lieutenant Governors

decision be reached. I am opposed to the item, and I therefore move:

That this item be reduced to one dollar.

**Mr. Cruickshank:** Oh, you want a vote, eh?

**Mr. MacDougall:** You can't buy much juice with one buck, Stanley.

**Mr. St. Laurent:** Before this item was placed in the estimates, I brought it to the attention of the leaders of the various groups, because it was felt that under present conditions there were onerous obligations of this kind that lieutenant governors had to incur in order properly to discharge their functions.

It may be that some day the provinces will come to the conclusion that they will prefer to have the function of opening and closing sessions and assenting to bills discharged by chief justices, and abolish the position of lieutenant governor. But it did not seem to us at this time that that was the mood of the Canadian people. We have felt that, so long as the function is maintained as part of our constitution, it would not be desirable that it be one available only to persons who could, out of their own resources, provide the services that have to be rendered to the public.

It was felt that it was proper for a lieutenant governor to visit the province where he carried out his functions—and we know they do that. We know that it does stimulate the interest of the people in this constitutional, monarchical form of government. It was felt that here an allowance should be provided which might or might not be used by a lieutenant governor. He is not going to be asked to produce the stubs of his tickets or vouchers of that kind, but he will have to submit accounts for expenditures incurred in discharging his functions.

The hon. gentleman says the amount of hospitality might not be commensurate with the size of the population. Well, it might not be exactly proportionate to the population, but both the travelling and the hospitality would be more extensive in the provinces where there are more people than they would be elsewhere; and it was felt that this provision would make it easier for men who do not have the wealth to provide these services out of their own resources to accept the responsibility of representing the sovereign in their respective provinces.

As to whether it should be done by amending the Salaries Act, there has been no change in this regard since that which was made under Sir John A. Macdonald in 1872. At confederation lieutenant governors were provided with a salary equal to twice that of the prime minister. A change was made in the salaries both of the ministers and of the

lieutenant governors in 1872-73. At that time the salaries of the lieutenant governors were set at what they are today, while the salary of the prime minister was set at \$8,000 and that of the other ministers at \$7,000. Two changes have been made since then in the salaries of the ministers, one in 1907 and the other in 1920, but none since 1873 in the salaries of the lieutenant governors.

**Mr. McLure:** Except in Prince Edward Island.

**Mr. St. Laurent:** Prince Edward Island was raised to \$8,000 only in 1949. It had continued at \$7,000 from 1873. This is not an increase in salary. This is something under which the lieutenant governor may be reimbursed amounts expended for travelling or for entertainment in the discharge of their duties, up to the limit mentioned. As long as the office is to continue it is not proper that it should be one that can be occupied only by those who have both the ability and the willingness to provide these services out of their own private funds.

**Mr. Coldwell:** It is perfectly true that the Prime Minister did inform me, at least, and I think probably the leaders of the other parties that this was to be put in the estimates, but as far as I am concerned I did not say I approved of it.

**Mr. St. Laurent:** Oh, no; I am not suggesting there was any approval. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre seemed to suggest there was something that had not been disclosed because the minister had said there was nothing new in these supplementary estimates, whilst I, before the item was placed in the estimates, notified the leaders of the various groups that it was the intention of the government to recommend such a vote to parliament.

**Mr. Coldwell:** But there was no commitment.

**Mr. St. Laurent:** There was no commitment.

**Mr. Abbott:** But it was not improper to put it in the final supplementaries, because it was understood it would be.

**Mr. Thatcher:** I suggest that at least the timing of this item is most unfortunate. I remind the Minister of Finance and the house of something he said in his budget last April 10. I want to read this one sentence, at page 1800 of *Hansard* for last year:

The necessities of defence now require that our expenditure for all other purposes should be reduced . . .

Surely if that is so this is not a very good type of expenditure to bring before the