

*Supply—Lieutenant Governors*

I must confess that I am not impressed by this procedure of putting a different name on a portion of the money they will receive by describing it as a travelling and hospitality allowance, as distinct from the other moneys they will receive as salaries. If it was the intention of the government to increase the income of these gentlemen then I suggest that, instead of doing it by means of an item in the estimates at all, it should have been done by proposing a change in the statute. If it was felt by the government that the salaries of lieutenant governors should be increased, why not come at it directly and change those salaries? I do not want it to be inferred that I would support such an increase. As a matter of fact I think that the money paid out in these salaries could be saved, and that the functions performed by lieutenant governors in the various provinces could be performed by the chief justices in the provinces. However, that issue is not before us now but, in view of what I said a moment ago, I felt that I should make my position clear.

As I say, if there is going to be a change, then let it be done by changing the statute rather than by bringing in an item in the estimates. It is a bad thing under any circumstances; but to do it in a supplementary item, particularly at a time when we are under pressure to get the items through because of the deadline created by this being the last day of the fiscal year, is a procedure the government ought not to have taken.

Then, I must confess that I do not approve of the basis upon which these moneys are to be paid. What is it to be for? It is for costs of travelling and hospitality incurred in the exercise of their duties. The amount that they will be allowed is based upon the population of the province. We are told that an amount of \$5,000 per annum is to be paid, plus \$1,000 per annum for each 100,000 or fraction thereof by which the population of a province at the last decennial census exceeded 500,000. Surely the amount of travelling or entertainment done by a lieutenant governor is not in direct proportion to the population of a province. If the function of these gentlemen is to provide a certain amount of hospitality and entertainment, I suggest it is limited by the number of days in the year rather than by the number of hundreds of thousands of people in a province.

I do not want anything I say to be considered as casting any reflection upon the gentlemen who occupy these posts. I can speak with some sincerity on this point, coming as I do from Manitoba, because of the very high respect which we in that province

have for the Hon. R. F. McWilliams and Mrs. McWilliams, who have been in Government House there for some ten or twelve years.

**Mr. Fraser:** And who came from Peterborough.

**Mr. Knowles:** I can also say, with respect to Mr. and Mrs. McWilliams, that when it comes to providing hospitality, those of us who come from Winnipeg know the kind of hospitality it will be. Some of us have had the privilege of attending at Government House from time to time, and when refreshments have been passed around at Government House I am glad to say they have consisted of such drinks as tomato juice, orange juice and ginger ale.

**Mr. Harkness:** They should cut off his entertainment allowance.

**Mr. Knowles:** In other words I have no fear as to how this money will be spent, so far as the lieutenant governor of my own province is concerned. However I am not so sure that all lieutenant governors follow the same practice as does the one in Manitoba.

I say that an item couched in these terms, which provides for expenses while travelling—which seems all right—but also for this business of entertainment and hospitality, raises a question mark which I do not think should be hung over the lieutenant governors of the provinces in this country. If there is a disposition on the part of the House of Commons—and I am against it—but if there is a disposition to increase the amount of money to be paid to lieutenant governors, then let the government do it by means of a change in the statute, but not in this way.

I have taken the trouble to read not only item 658 before us, as it appears in these supplementary estimates for the fiscal year which closes at midnight tonight, but I have also read the corresponding item in the estimates for the fiscal year beginning tomorrow. I am somewhat concerned by the fact that that corresponding item does not contain half as much detail as does the one before us.

**Mr. Abbott:** I will help my hon. friend in that connection. When the item to which he refers comes up in the main estimates I will move, or someone on my behalf, to have the language of this item substituted for that appearing in the main estimates now.

**Mr. Knowles:** I thank the minister. I am glad to know that that will be done.

**Mr. Cruickshank:** Oh, get on with it.

**Mr. Knowles:** All right; hon. members want to get on with it. I am prepared to let a