

Business of Supply

bers of the media compare that figure with a figure, say, of some ten years later, of \$1,400,000, more or less, which represents a twofold increase for the PMO and \$8 million for the Privy Council office. But the difference is this: in these estimates, the Privy Council estimates cover \$1,260,000-odd for the Institute for Research on Public Policy, and \$230,000-odd for the National Committee on Human Rights and Treaties, and so on. So you can look at each year's figures and see that quite a number of activities were brought under these estimates which previously had not been brought under the Prime Minister's office or the Privy Council office.

Actually, when I was working in one of the offices as a civil servant back in 1949, it was the custom of the PCO and the PMO to borrow civil servants, who remained on the budgets of other departments. Therefore, if people want to make a scientific analysis of this, they should ask for exact facts and compare similar things. I repeat, my office and the Privy Council office are always ready to make such facts available to those who want to make an honest comparison and not just hit the headlines.

Another example of escalation is that of the office of the leader of the opposition. It is important to note the change there. The office of the leader of the opposition on June 1, 1968, had allocated to it 13 positions. At present it has 27 positions, so that its size has more than doubled. To speak of salaries, in my case and over a longer period they have been multiplied, I believe, by a factor of three. The salaries paid for positions in the leader of the opposition's office went from \$129,000-odd in 1968 to \$517,000 in the present day, which is more than a fourfold increase. The same is true of the office of the leader of the New Democratic Party and of the leader of the Social Credit party. Expenditures for their offices have increased about fourfold.

Therefore, I do not think people should get too excited when I say that expenditures for my office have also increased for that period. I might say that the figures given do not include the budgets of party research bureaux. I remind the committee, with some immodesty, that it was my government in 1968 which innovated in this regard. We believed in the importance of the opposition having research staffs which would permit them to discharge their functions. Those functions are to do with the analysing of policy, of legislation and the asking of pertinent questions in the House.

Mr. Baldwin: There has not been much result from the spending of all that money.

Mr. Trudeau: I agree.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): It doesn't seem to have helped the opposition.

Mr. Trudeau: The budget of the research bureau of the Progressive Conservative Party went from zero in 1968 to \$250,000 in 1975, which represents an infinitely large increase. Even if we start in 1969, we get \$125,000 in 1969 and \$251,000 in 1971; that is slightly more than double. In the case of the New Democratic Party it has more than doubled. In the case of the Social Credit party it has not quite doubled.

● (1550)

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Chairman, I realize the Prime Minister is trying to save time, but twice now he has given the actual figures for the official opposition. In the case of the other two parties he just gives the ratio of the increase. He might give those figures as well.

Mr. Trudeau: Yes, Mr. Chairman. In the case of the office of the NDP leader, in January of 1970—and this is two years later than in the case of the official opposition—total salaries were \$36,600. At present, not only have positions doubled but the salaries have increased to \$147,900.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Trudeau: In the case of the Social Credit party, in January of 1970 the figure was \$28,600; at present it is \$104,700.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Trudeau: If I combine these two tables and put the salaries of the staff of the Leader of the Opposition with those of the official opposition research bureau, we go from a figure, in 1968, of \$129,000 to a figure, in 1975, of \$769,000.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Trudeau: That is an increase of more than six times. It is worth while noting that this does not include the salaries of the assistants of the opposition House leader—who would probably need more but he is getting this at the present time—assistants to the former prime minister and assistants to the chief opposition whip. If you add these expenditures, you get into some sizeable amounts.

An hon. Member: Tell the truth.

Mr. Trudeau: I am sure each member of this House has his own views of what is the truth. What I am pointing out is that the hon. member for Leeds is making fraudulent use of statistics. I hope it is not intentional.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Cossitt: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a question of privilege. I have been accused by the Prime Minister of making "fraudulent" use, I believe that was his word, of statistics. I consider that to be told that anything I have done in this House is fraudulent is a reflection of my character, which I am not prepared to accept. The Prime Minister this afternoon is stretching things out, not answering legitimate questions from the opposition because he wants to use up time, and making remarks about the character of members of the opposition. That is an affront to this House. A lot of members of this House are getting mighty tired sitting here listening to a man—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Cossitt: It is time he accounted to the Canadian people for the expenses of his office, and quickly.