

departments, the Department of Customs and Excise, and the Department of Taxation. Those departments do not exist.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member will realize that I was quite ready to read right through. I enjoy the sound of my voice—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: —and I was willing to go through, but hon. members insisted that I dispense.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): They did not insist. The government did.

Mr. Speaker: This is the only reason I did not proceed with the reading, but at the same time I do not think I have authority to go back and again put a motion that has been carried on division.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, if I may refer to the point of order raised by the hon. member I myself noticed in the motion the reference to the particular departments mentioned by the hon. member, and I made inquiries. I did not have an opportunity to look at the book but it may be that the book does not contain those phrases. If it does not I will be happy tomorrow to move to correct the motion on my own account.

Mr. McGrath: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, I have examined the estimates and I notice there are votes there for the department of the environment. I suggest to the House that there is no such thing as the department of the environment, and the government is anticipating something the House may not do.

Mr. Trudeau: Oh!

Mr. McGrath: Oh, fuddly-dud, or whatever it was you said. I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that the government has no right to anticipate what the House may do. I submit to Your Honour that there is an amendment before the committee of the whole House which would change the name of the proposed department, and presumably the House may agree to that amendment. Where would that leave the estimates for a department that does not exist?

Mr. Speaker: The point of order is an interesting one, but I would think that at that point the estimates would have to be amended. We might be anticipating that stage of the proceedings. I realize the difficulty that has been pointed out by the hon. member and by the hon. member for Edmonton West, but again I say that if the House decided in its wisdom to accept the amendment now being considered in committee of the whole, and which I assume in due course would be approved by the House, then it is the estimates that would have to be changed.

Questions

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

PROPOSED FEDERAL BUILDING, AMHERST, N.S.

Question No. 45—Mr. Coates:

1. On what date did the government indicate its intention to construct a federal building at Amherst, Nova Scotia?

2. Were properties purchased for this proposed site of the federal building and, if so (a) what was the total cost of securing the property in question (b) on what dates were the government properties secured (c) on what date was the preparation for the site completed?

3. Were designs prepared and made public of the proposed new federal building for Amherst and, if so (a) on what date were the designs completed (b) on what date were they released to the public (c) what was the total cost for the preparation of the designs in question?

4. (a) On what date was a decision reached to abandon the proposed design for the new federal building in Amherst and for what reason (b) were plans then initiated for the preparation of a new design and, if so (i) on what date did work start on the preparation of a new design for the federal building (ii) at what cost?

5. (a) On what date was a decision reached to abandon the construction of a new federal building at Amherst (b) for what reason (c) what was the total cost to the federal government associated with the preparation of the plans to start such a federal building?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works): 1. On February 14, 1966 when the 1966-67 Estimates were tabled.

2. Yes, (a) \$71,404.25. (b) November 21, 1966; April 3, 1967; August 17, 1967. (c) December 31, 1967.

3. Designs were prepared but they were not made public. (a) October 1967, April 1968, April 1969. (b) The designs were not released to the public. (c) \$22,100.

4. (a) February 17, 1970—due to a change in client requirements. (b) Plans were initiated for the design of a single-purpose new post office building. (i) August 4, 1970 for a new post office; (ii) The new post office is being designed by departmental staff at an estimated cost of \$2,600.

5. (a) February 17, 1970. (b) A change in client requirements. (c) \$22,100.

PROPOSED ENLARGEMENT OF POST OFFICE BUILDING, AMHERST, N.S.

Question No. 46—Mr. Coates:

1. On what date did the government initiate plans to extend the federal building used as the post office at Amherst, Nova Scotia, and was property purchased to facilitate the proposed extension and, if so, on what date was property purchased and at what cost to the federal treasury?

2. On what date were the proposed plans to extend the post office abandoned and what was the total cost to the federal treasury of the planning and property purchases, including the