

voted. In former years the estimates contained some 500 or more separate votes, and the main estimates for 1964-65 contain only 230 such items. This reduction has been accomplished by consolidating a large number of items formerly in the vote section of the estimates, while at the same time preserving the same amount of information as in the past in the detailed section. This change is in keeping with the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Government Organization. The change will do much not only to facilitate discussion of the estimates, but also to improve the quality of financial management in the public service.

With the permission of the house, I propose now to place on *Hansard* three tables relating to the 1964-65 estimates. Table I compares the 1964-65 estimates with the total budgetary estimates for several preceding years. Table II compares the statutory expenditures for 1964-65 with those for 1963-64. Table III indicates the changes in the Main Estimates between 1963-64 and 1964-65 by an examination of operating, capital and other costs.

Hon. A. J. Brooks: Honourable senators, I want to say just a word about this matter. First of all, I thank the honourable Leader of the Government for his courtesy in speaking to me about the placing on the record of remarks made yesterday, not by the Minister of Trade and Commerce but by his parliamentary secretary.

Hon. Mr. Connolly (Ottawa West): Yes, that is right.

Hon. Mr. Brooks: It is very difficult for me to decide on the spur of the moment whether

or not this is a precedent that should be accepted by the Senate. So far as this particular statement is concerned, I see no objection to it, but the placing upon the record of a statement by a parliamentary secretary to a minister would seem to establish a precedent so far as the Senate is concerned.

In the other place this proposal was objected to by two of the Opposition parties. It was felt that the minister's statement should be made by the minister himself; that it should be made at a time when he was present.

I am not objecting to this procedure this evening, but I do think that very careful consideration should be given to it. Are we going to accept the statements, for instance, of all ministers made in London, or Paris, or at the United Nations, or in other parts of the world on the different matters that they happen to be discussing at the time? If we are, I think we will soon find the Senate *Hansard* cluttered with remarks that we could very well read in the *Hansard* of the other place. It does seem to me that we would be getting second-hand notice of these important matters.

I raise this particular point, honourable senators, and I want it understood that we are not accepting this as a precedent for all future time.

Hon. Mr. Burchill: Honourable senators, may I ask the honourable Leader of the Government whether the schedule that he referred to a few minutes ago includes the supplementary figures for 1963?

Hon. Mr. Connolly (Ottawa West): No, it does not.

(Tables I, II and III follow)