

Financial Administration

isters for their cars. It so happens that back prior to 1931 instead of cabinet ministers getting the allowances they now get, they were provided with cars and chauffeurs. It appears that in 1931 Mr. Bennett, the then prime minister, as one of the economy measures he was putting into effect, decided that the providing of individual cars and chauffeurs to cabinet ministers should be done away with, and that in its place there should be provision of an annual allowance of \$2,000. That was done by an item in the estimates for the year 1931, as set out in item 352 in the Appropriation Act, No. 5, 1931, which is chapter 61 of the statutes of that year.

Perhaps I should put this item on record so that the story will be complete. Item 352 of that year reads as follows:

To provide for payment annually from the consolidated revenue fund of a 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, \$42,000.

What puzzled me, when I first learned about this, was that there has been in the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act all along, and there has been carried forward into the financial administration act now before us, provisions which seem to me to make it impossible for continuing payments like that to be made.

There is in section 32 of the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act the following provision:

Balances of appropriations which remain unexpended at the end of a fiscal year shall lapse and be written off . . .

That same provision is being carried forward, although in somewhat expanded wording, as section 35 in the bill now before us.

Then, as section 23 of the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act, we find this provision:

All estimates of expenditures submitted to parliament shall be for the services coming in course of payment during the fiscal year.

And that same section is being carried forward as section 25 of the present bill. My feeling, as I studied this matter, was that it looks to me as though the estimates for any year must, by virtue of the section I have just read, be for moneys to be spent in that fiscal year, and that fiscal year only. It looks

also from the section I read a moment ago as though any money remaining unexpended by the end of the year must lapse.

On the basis of this I have found it difficult to understand how that appropriation of \$42,000 in 1931 could be the basis of continuing payments of \$38,000, \$40,000 or \$44,000 a year, across the years, as has been done. I still cannot understand it. In all fairness I must admit that the Auditor General sees nothing illegal about it, and I understand the Department of Justice has gone into the matter.

The important point is that, in the estimates as we get them each year, motor car allowances to cabinet ministers are included with their salaries. They are not set out separately as items of \$10,000 for salary and \$2,000 for car allowance, but rather they are included together as \$12,000, with the letter "S" appearing in the margin indicating that these amounts are statutory. There is no question about the \$10,000 salary being statutory, because provision for that salary is made in an act of parliament passed in the usual manner. But the so-called statutory basis for the \$2,000 is not found in any act stating that every cabinet minister shall receive this \$2,000 every year, but rather is found as an item in the estimates for one year, a year long since passed, namely 1931; and the money voted for that year was expended long ago.

That is the way I feel about it, namely that it should not be paid on the basis of an estimate at all, but rather that it should be put into a statute, perhaps the Senate and House of Commons Act, or into the various statutes making provision for departments of government and for the salaries of cabinet ministers.

My contention is that, just as the Secretary of State (Mr. Bradley) has now given notice of a bill to clean up the confusion with respect to the salaries of the civil service commissioners, and just as other matters along that line which the Auditor General has suggested from time to time, are in process of being cleaned up, so the government should come along and clean this up, too. It should not go on year after year putting the letter "S" opposite this sum of money, because it cannot be pointed out to us in any statute that there is such a permanent or statutory provision as that letter "S" is supposed to indicate.

I know this matter has presented itself to the Prime Minister as a problem, because the last time new departments were created—that was in the fall of 1949—the question came up. On that occasion I asked him some