

Treasury Board with regard to salaries and the non-disclosure of salaries at certain executive levels, particularly with regard to premiums or merit pay. The presentation of the estimates in this form conceals information from members who are entitled to pass on the salary levels and conditions of employment of the government.

With regard to the size of the estimates I do not think anybody who has taken a good look at the totality of the estimates last year and in past years could doubt there would be an increase. The estimates are now approaching \$13 billion. Last year the total was just under \$12 billion, and with the supplementary estimates the amount will have gone just over the \$12 billion mark.

When we consider that in 1963-64 the total estimates or total expenditures of the government were just over \$6.4 billion we can see that the series of Liberal administrations has more than doubled government expenditures at the federal level. We have complained from time to time that this government follows the practice of taxing up to expenditures. It is for this reason that we are facing continuous surcharges or additional taxes. Now that the government tax proposals essentially increase tax rates under a so-called simplification of the tax tables—

• (2:30 p.m.)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: No, no!

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): —it is part of the answer that we see this year an increase of some \$900 million in expenditures.

Mr. Stanfield: I thought they were going to reduce them.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): In the Department of National Health and Welfare hospital insurance, of course, is costing close to \$100 million more this year and medicare \$70 million more. The President of the Treasury Board did not disclose whether any provision had been made for possible expenditures if the province of Quebec should come into the medicare program. If that were to be the case then any remarks he has made with respect to supplementary estimates would be quite irrelevant because they would certainly be a long way off the mark.

We will see in the press tonight, after its members have had an opportunity to examine these estimates in detail, comment on the

Questions

highlights of this program. I trust that the committees of the House will also look at these estimates very closely, Mr. Speaker.

As a general conclusion may I say it seems to me that once we see which departments have been given their head and what is happening to them as far as their personnel and spending programs are concerned, we will be able to judge whether the austerity program initiated last August was a true austerity program or an attempted exercise in public relations.

PRIVILEGE

MR. THOMPSON—ATTITUDE OF GOVERNMENT TOWARD ADJOURNMENT DEBATE—REQUEST FOR CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, with the unanimous consent of the House I move, seconded by the hon. member for Wellington, that the question of privilege raised by myself earlier today be referred to the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization.

Some hon. Members: No.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: There is not unanimous consent.

An hon. Member: Who said no?

Mr. Trudeau: I did.

An hon. Member: You fellows get used to saying no at home.

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

NATIONAL DEFENCE BUILDING, LEBRETON FLATS

Question No. 455—Mr. Winch:

1. What expenditures were made on all aspects of the planning and design of the Department of National Defence Building that was to have been constructed in Lebreton Flats?

2. What are the expenditures both actual and estimated, to date, required to redesign the proposed Department of Transport building to suit the needs of the Department of National Defence?

3. Were any on-site preparations undertaken for the proposed Lebreton Flats building and what were the costs?

4. What, if any, are the plans for the use of the Lebreton Flats site formerly intended for the Department of National Defence?