

on which is the item under discussion, and I find an item greater than the total of these I have read. With the money that we are asked to vote for that one item we could double our grants to all the institutions that I have just mentioned. Surely when the government takes the ground that because of the state of the treasury, it cannot grant more than five or ten thousand dollars to these national institutions that are attempting to carry on a national work for the welfare of the public, we cannot but pause and ask whether we are justified in spending so much on carpets and curtains and all sorts of luxuries of that kind. Only in the papers to-day I read that the Prime Minister and the government have refused to continue the grant to the provinces for technical education—a matter that is vitally connected with the industrial welfare of this country and with the future of our girls and boys. When the Dominion government cannot see its way to continue its grants to the provinces for this important work, I wonder if we are justified in continuing such large expenditures of this kind.

When the beautification of the city of Ottawa was being considered I did not once rise, not that I did not feel strongly on the matter, but I was willing to let that one large expenditure go by, and other people were protesting. I yield to no one in my desire to have the capital city beautiful and dignified, but I would submit that we are in danger of centralizing the beauty and the dignity of the country here in the capital city, and letting other parts of the country go with very little consideration. I say, therefore, that it behooves us, when items of this character come up, to check them very closely. In this particular case it is not as if those things represented by this expenditure were available to all. The reason I feel most strongly with regard to matters of this kind is that in reality only a very small class, a very exclusive class, gets whatever benefit there is in an expenditure of this kind. It is only a few people who can go to Rideau Hall. It is only a few people who can enjoy these things. It is only a small class in Ottawa, most of them having opportunities in other ways of enjoying good food and pleasant surroundings. As long as there are so many under-privileged in this country, I question whether we are justified in adding still further to the advantages of the over-privileged classes.

[Mr. Woodsworth.]

There is another consideration I should like to advance, and it is this. I take it that from now on the governor general will be chosen on the advice of His Majesty's ministers in Canada. He will be the representative of His Majesty, but be chosen on the advice of His Majesty's Canadian ministers. Undoubtedly it will be only a short time before the one so chosen will be a Canadian. I have no objection to having a representative from the motherland here. I think we should have one, and we are going to have one here soon in a new capacity. But supposing as the representative of His Majesty in this country there is appointed, on the advice of his Canadian ministers, a Canadian. Do we wish to continue to maintain a standard of this kind? Again I come back to my ideals of Canadian citizenship. I believe we are acting in harmony with the ideals of the great majority of Canadians if we endeavour to approximate as nearly as possible to a condition under which everyone will have more or less an equal chance. By these votes we are setting up privileges that are available to a comparatively small group, but which must be paid for out of the taxation of the masses of this country. On behalf of the labour people whom I am trying to represent—and I know I have the backing of a great many outside that group—I protest again, as I did the other evening, against these very lavish expenditures.

Mr. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman, for many years I have supported in this house votes for the necessary improvements and to meet the necessary expenses in connection with the residence of the governor general. I believe Canada should be reasonably generous towards such votes; but we have before us certain proposals of the government which are extravagant and unreasonable. For years there has appeared in the estimates an item of \$60,000, described as: "Rideau Hall, including grounds—improvements, furniture, maintenance, etc." In other words, that item is to maintain and preserve the dignity and high standing of the residence. In addition to that, immediately below is an item of \$19,000, being an allowance for fuel and light—really part of the expenses of the establishment. There is nothing paid out of that item for the salaries of clerks or other members of the staff. Last session this house voted an extra sum of \$50,000 for special work at Rideau Hall. I had no great objection to it. It was granted as a special vote. But we find this year the