

*Supply—External Affairs*

The list extends down through the library to the bedrooms:

Bedroom No. 21		
Furniture .....	\$3,117.60	
Rug .....	472.60	
Drapes and bedspread .....	281.12	
Lamps .....	441.90	
		\$4,313.12
Bedroom No. 22		
Furniture .....	\$3,123.00	
Rug .....	472.50	
Drapes and bedspread .....	355.60	
Lamps .....	301.50	
		\$4,250.60

I shall not delay the house with details of some of these other rooms. In bedroom No. 18 the furnishings cost in the aggregate \$3,191.92. For bedroom No. 16 the total is \$2,500. For the hallways, the furniture, rugs and lamps cost \$3,223. For the terrace off the library the furnishings cost \$1,392; those for the terrace off the dining room, \$1,816; those for the swimming pool gallery, \$1,898. Then there are miscellaneous furnishings; silver flatware and hollowware, \$4,400; china, \$648; formal and informal table linen, \$2,305; and so it goes.

**Mr. Pickersgill:** What did they pay for the flag?

**Mr. Fleming:** The Minister of Citizenship and Immigration regards extravagance as a very light matter. In this he is far out of contact with the experience of the average Canadian taxpayer. The exemptions allowed to Canadian taxpayers are quite inadequate; and if the minister would exercise his ingenuity to eliminate extravagance it might be possible for the Minister of Finance—I think it is possible now—but it might bring the Minister of Finance to make these exemptions adequate, to raise them beyond the present inadequate figures of \$1,000 for single persons and \$2,000 for married persons without dependents.

There was a point raised about mirrors, and the question was asked in the committee about the price of two eighteenth century mirrors, that were purchased for the embassy. The first information we had from the department is shown at page 390 of the report, where the official said:

I am told that it was approximately \$2,000 for those mirrors.

Later on the price of the mirrors was inquired into further by the department and the answer was brought back to the committee at page 433 that the two mirrors did not cost \$2,000 but cost \$1,078.

I have read these details to bring to the attention of the house the rather impressive items which lurk behind some of the big figures that appear in these estimates. It

seems to me that we are too disposed in this committee to take these items in the aggregate without going back into the details behind them. When we go back into the details, this is the sort of thing that unfortunately we find there.

As I said last night, we cannot now undo this extravagance. This expenditure has been incurred, but I bring it to the attention of the house in order that the house may warn the government and the Department of External Affairs that it does not intend to tolerate extravagance on this scale in the future.

There is, however, one thing we can do in reference to this year's estimates in this respect. We are dealing with item No. 95, which provides approximately \$2,000,000 for construction, acquisition or improvement of buildings, works, land, equipment and furnishings. In this item, as we see in the details at page 178 and following, there are specific amounts set out for capital as well as operational expenditures at various embassies and diplomatic posts abroad. There is one subitem at the end, at the bottom of page 183, to which I invite the attention of the house. After listing in detail the proposed expenditures on operations of a capital nature at all these posts abroad, there is one item headed "Miscellaneous—unallotted capital items"—\$805,000.

The facts I have brought to the attention of the house in connection with the embassy at Rio ought to alert the house to the necessity of exercising as much supervision over proposed expenditures by this department in this respect as may be possible, but here we are told that there is in this item a sum of \$805,000 that has no tag whatever attached to it and which, if it is passed, the department is at complete liberty to expend in the purchase or improvement of any property or the purchase of furnishings anywhere in the world. There are no strings attached to it.

I submit to this house, as I submitted to the standing committee on external affairs, that this is not the way in which the House of Commons ought to do its business. One of our duties here is to assert the principle of strict parliamentary control over expenditures, and here we are told, on the face of these estimates, that there is a sum of \$805,000 that is not earmarked for any place in the world and which can be used for the purpose of a capital outlay by the department anywhere in the whole globe.

I submit that is not a proper way for the House of Commons to deal with proposed expenditure. I moved in the committee that the subitem should be stricken out, because while we are quite prepared to deal on its