

*Business of Supply*

established a series of guidelines. They were presented to this House under the title "Guidelines for Notices of Motions for Production of Papers", but they applied to the general question of secrecy. These guidelines were originally tabled by the present Secretary of State for External Affairs, who was then the House leader, on March 15, 1973—more than two years ago. They are appendix B to the debates of March 15, 1973.

Two weeks later, the guidelines were referred to the Joint Committee on Regulations and other Statutory Instruments, and I must say that no action was ever taken by that committee to come to grips with these guidelines, to show possibly how they could be improved and made compatible with as open a government as possible. But once again, in a system of parliamentary responsibility, the guidelines were tabled in this parliament in December and on the same day they were referred to the same joint committee. There have already been a few witnesses appear before that committee. I want to say that this government is anxiously awaiting the results of the report of that standing committee, because it is possible that it would be able to improve the guidelines without deterring from the very basic need of the parliamentary system, of having officials in the position where they can advise their ministers without the danger of that advice becoming completely public—a situation which experience has proved only results in the officials being extremely cautious and perhaps less than candid in tendering advice. We want the best possible advice from the officials, and in order to receive it they must be protected from public scrutiny of their every opinion.

The next point I would like to deal with—I realize I should not go into great detail here because the committee will want to have some time to ask questions—is the size of my estimates, the amount of spending generally by the Prime Minister and his office, and in the Privy Council. There would be two categories of questions under this heading. The first, I suppose, comes under the category of chandeliers and ashtrays.

**An hon. Member:** And swimming pools. Tell us about that.

**Mr. Trudeau:** And swimming pools. I do not think it is a matter of policy. It is perhaps a matter of debate and curiosity, but the facts are known. Judgments can be made. I will deal with it very briefly and I hope some time will be left for the most fundamental question, that of these expenditures and what functions they are intended to permit the operation of. I would not even bother if merely the hon. member for Leeds or perhaps the hon. member for Rocky Mountain were curious about this; but I was somewhat disappointed that the right hon. gentleman for Prince Albert made it the subject matter of a speech he made on April 30, after his long absence, when he returned to the House and naturally had many things to say. He used part of his speech to comment on what I call the "chandelier" category of spending. The right hon. member for Prince Albert was predicting what my salary will be in ten years at the present rate of inflation. I thank him for the confidence he has shown in me—

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

[Mr. Trudeau.]

**Mr. Trudeau:** —and particularly for shedding some light on the opinion he holds of the present leader and future leaders of his party.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Stanfield:** Mr. Chairman, it is only a question of time, but I realize that time is running into May and running out on the Prime Minister. I do not want to cut him off under the 15-minute rule, but particularly since his time in the committee will be limited I hope he will be as brief as he can.

**Mr. Trudeau:** I thank the hon. member for drawing the time to my attention, but I did point out at the outset that I had offered to speak after a member of his party so that I would know exactly to what subject I was expected to address myself. They deferred and asked me to speak first, for which reason I am trying to cover a variety of subjects, and naturally that takes a bit more time.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Trudeau:** I am sure it is just by accident that the Leader of the Opposition rose at the precise moment I was going to quote from the speech of the right hon. member for Prince Albert. I will go back to that and read from *Hansard* of April 30 at page 5344:

Let me go back to the days when I was Prime Minister. We had to pay \$5,000 a year rent for 24 Sussex Drive; that is to say, Mr. St. Laurent did, I did when I followed him, and Mr. Pearson did after me. This rental payment has been done away with.

I suggest that is a rather unfair comment. Perhaps he forgot, but the right hon. gentleman certainly knows that this rental payment was abolished by an act of the twenty-eighth parliament—two parliaments ago—in a bill which I introduced regarding the official residences, the Official Residences Act. I made sure that this abolition of rent would only be applicable in the next parliament; in other words, it was not applicable to me. I, like Mr. St. Laurent, Mr. Pearson and Mr. Diefenbaker, had to pay rent. It was only after the next election when the people chose, by a rather slim margin, the same prime minister that the new law took effect. The Leader of the Opposition, with his usual fairness, will recollect that that was the aspect of the bill.

He will also recollect that the same bill, which turned Stornoway into public property and the residence of Mr. Speaker, the farm, into public property, was made effective immediately because hon. members know that we had some concern about the previous arrangement whereby the leader of the opposition and Mr. Speaker were receiving benefits under the Crown, the NCC was working on their property, and so on. They could have been disqualified under the act of parliament.

**Mr. Cossitt:** What about the swimming pool?

**Mr. Trudeau:** We, not having the same kind of petty mind as the hon. member for Leeds, did not want to exploit that situation; that is why we made the act effective immediately in the case of Stornoway and the farm, and effective after the next election in the case of the residence of the prime minister. I find it unfortunate that