

he comes back home he finds that the roof over his head disappeared while he was fighting for democracy and our democratic institutions?

Mr. JACKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I wish to bring up a matter on this item, but my remarks will apply to all departments. It is an item of \$12,000, which includes \$10,000 as the minister's salary and \$2,000 as car allowance. I bring it up in connection with this department because the Minister of Finance is charged with keeping the expenses of the country down as much as possible. Certainly he is charged with that as much as any other minister of the crown and it is therefore his responsibility to some extent. I also bring it up because I have heard—I have no authority for this except common rumour—that the Minister of Finance may not accept the \$2,000 for car allowance. Of that I do not know. It is common knowledge that there are many ministers of the crown who are making great sacrifices to serve the state. They do it at great financial loss to themselves in order to help in the war effort, and they make sacrifices in times of peace as well. Many private members of the house also make considerable sacrifices in serving their country as best they can. However, this \$2,000 car allowance, if prorated on a mileage basis at 7½ cents a mile, which is the common commercial figure for automobile expenses, would represent a total of 26,660 miles. It cannot be said that ministers are to-day entitled to a chauffeur. Certainly the Prime Minister, even in these times, should have a chauffeur to facilitate his getting about, but with the shortage of man-power I do not believe there are other ministers of the crown, certainly not many, who are entitled to a chauffeur in these days, at the expense of the state. Against this 26,660 miles is the fact that we have now gasoline rationing and the ordinary person is not allowed to drive more than 4,000 or 5,000 miles. It is an utter impossibility for a minister to be attending to his duties in the house and in his department and use the money he gets on automobile travelling. Not only is this \$2,000 given to ministers as car allowance, but it is tax free, and that means—

The CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I do not believe it would be in order at this time to discuss an expense which is not before the committee to be voted. The item of \$2,000 for each minister of the crown is a statutory allowance. It has been fixed by statute. If the hon. gentleman desires to discuss the propriety of the continuance of that item of expense he should introduce legislation or discuss it at the proper time—for instance, on

a motion to go into supply, or otherwise. But this item which is the only thing referred to the committee of supply and which is under discussion does not permit of such a debate. With respect to the general principle which the hon. member has set out, namely, that on the departmental administration item now before us, hon. members may discuss any item of finance, that would be quite preposterous. Rule 58 (2) is clear. When we are in committee hon. members must adhere strictly to the item before the chair. If the principle urged by the hon. gentleman were to be allowed, it would then be permissible under this item, to discuss any question of subsidies on wheat or wheat acreage, or any other matter of that sort, which would mean reopening a debate already disposed of. I must rule that the hon. gentleman cannot discuss this point at the present juncture.

Mr. JACKMAN: The salary of the Minister of Finance, and motor car allowance, are both set forth—

The CHAIRMAN: That is statutory.

Mr. JACKMAN: I realize that "S" means statutory, but I find it difficult to have an opportunity to discuss the matter in the absence of any statute or resolution which would make discussion possible.

The CHAIRMAN: I could point out a number of opportunities; I am not here to point out to hon. members such opportunities. I am here to expedite the proceedings of the house in an orderly manner. I could say, however, that such opportunity is available on the speech from the throne, on the budget debate, or on any motion for the house to go into supply except on Thursdays and Fridays.

Mr. JACKMAN: I must accept your ruling.

Item agreed to.

48. Bank inspection (Inspector General of Banks' office), \$27,042.

Mr. COLDWELL: I know that the matter of maintaining parity between Canadian and United States funds has been discussed during the session and I do not propose to deal with it now. The policy has already been laid down, although I think that with the large imports into Canada some arrangement with the United States for parity between the two dollars would have been beneficial to the war. However, I have been asked a question which I cannot answer. When we sell United States funds we sell at a premium of 10 per cent if they are dollar bills, and, I believe, 7 per cent on silver. If we buy we pay 11 per cent in each case. Who gets it?