

perience on the few occasions when I have visited vice-regal residence lead me to believe it is the common thing in such places and forms, so to speak, part of the position.

Mr. ARTHURS: Not \$70,000 for a year.

Mr. POWER: I quite understand that \$70,000 for a year would be a great deal of money. My hon. friend is mistaken. The amount of \$70,000 is not per annum. Let us hope with this amount the furniture purchased will be of such a nature that it will last for a considerable number of years. The hon. member for Rimouski (Sir Eugene Fiset) suggests that it should last for another century. If it does—and I have no doubt that is what is in the mind of the Minister of Public Works—no doubt a hundred years hence those who follow us will be protesting in the same way as hon. members are to-night against an expenditure of such an amount of money as \$70,000 for furniture.

I commend the vote to hon. members, first, on the ground that we cannot dissociate from the citadel and from the walls themselves the quarters of the governors within them, and, second, that as we are to house the governor, whether it be in Quebec or in Ottawa, we must see to it that the furnishings and the interior of the building are so arranged that he can receive in a manner befitting his dignity and proper to the governor of a country like ours the distinguished visitors whom he often has to receive.

Mr. HEAPS: A few moments ago I asked the minister if he would give the committee some idea as to the annual upkeep of the governor general's quarters in the citadel of Quebec, what the amount of \$100,000 voted last year was spent on in connection with making the place habitable for the governor general, and also what the present item of \$150,000 is for.

Mr. ELLIOTT: With regard to the probable cost of upkeep in the future, it is quite impossible to give an accurate estimate. One can judge only from what has happened in the past. Up to 1871 the imperial government had maintained this structure, but the Canadian government took it over in that year. From 1871 up to about fifteen years ago we spent money upon it from time to time, but about then the expenditures practically ceased. From December 2, 1871, up until twelve years ago we had expended \$269,929.

Mr. CHAPLIN: That was up until twelve years ago?

Mr. ELLIOTT: It is nearly fifteen years now. There has been no expenditure since the outbreak of the war. My hon. friend the Solicitor General has stated that the cost of this whole structure was in the vicinity of \$40,000,000. That is the best estimate we can obtain. It is impossible to consider the governor general's quarters apart from the citadel itself. A point that I think is being lost sight of by my hon. friends is that this is not an innovation by any means; it is not a new form of expenditure. Until circumstances during the war made it impossible to continue the expenditures, these expenditures were always made, and of course now we have to make good the great depreciation that took place during the years in which the building was allowed practically to fall into decay. That is the position with which we are now confronted. I just want to say, as one coming from a province other than that in which this expenditure is to be made, that surely we are not in the present condition of affairs going to take a backward step in so far as providing accommodation of this kind in our neighbouring province is concerned.

I want for a moment to direct the attention of the committee to the position in which we would find ourselves if the motion moved by my hon. friend were to carry. The money that we have expended has been spent on building and structural repairs. An additional amount is required. I think my hon. friends will agree that it was made perfectly clear by me last year that the amount then voted was only an estimate, because it was impossible to tell at that time what the condition of the building was. As they took up the floors and certain repairs were made, it was found that in many cases the condition was even worse than had been expected, and that, of course, necessitated larger expenditures. The amount that is now required is what we are asking for here. The principle of maintaining a residence for the governor general at the city of Quebec was settled last year.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes, that principle was accepted practically unanimously by the house last year.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. ELLIOTT: It was. There was no vote on it, and the discussion which took place was all along that line.

Mr. FANSHER (Last Mountain): The vote last year was just for repairs.