

mittee. I did, in courtesy and because of my admiration for him, attempt on a couple of occasions today to contact the chairman of the committee to explain why I was not familiar with this. I think it is incumbent upon my colleagues in this chamber to examine some of these other immense types of expenditure, and not only those which they have already examined such as Information Canada, but so many other things that involve many multiples of what is referred to here. I am sure that my esteemed colleague, Senator Everett, will do that. I refer particularly to some recent publicity about how many chiefs and how relatively few Indians we have added recently in so many departments.

**Hon. Mr. Everett:** Honourable senators, in considering the report on the estimates for the year ending March 31, 1974, your committee has noted that budgetary estimates total \$18.393 billion, and added to that will be \$893 million of loans, investments and advances.

Dealing with the budgetary side, this figure of \$18.393 billion compares to initial estimates for the year ending March 31, 1973, of \$15.749 billion. Through the introduction of supplementary estimates in the last fiscal year, that \$15.749 billion was increased to \$16.548 billion. In addition to that there were loans, investments and advances of \$1.717 billion. If we look at the increase in terms of initial budgets we are talking about an increase from \$15.749 billion last year to \$18.393 billion this year. That is an increase in one year of \$2.644 billion in budgetary expenditures. In percentage terms it works out at 16.8 per cent. If we take the \$16.548 billion, which is the initial budgetary expenditure and add to that the supplementary estimates for the fiscal year, we find that the increase is \$1.845 billion, or 11.1 per cent. These estimates of \$18.393 billion which you have before you will be increased this year by supplementary estimates. It would therefore be true to say that the increase in our budgetary expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1974 over March 3, 1973, will run between 11.1 per cent and 16.8 per cent. Between 1971 and 1972 the gross national product of the country increased by 10.7 per cent in current dollars and 5.8 per cent in terms of 1961 dollars. It is true that the gross national product in 1973 over 1972 will probably increase at a faster rate than it did in 1972 over 1971. Nevertheless, it would appear that the government's share of the gross national product is increasing and continuing to increase as far as the federal government's responsibility is concerned. For goods and services it has been decreasing, but the transfers to the provinces have caused the total to increase faster than the gross national product.

● (1410)

We have listed in the report specific items which account for the major portion of the increase. They are to be found at page 2, item 6 of the report, as follows:

#### Increases in Statutory Items

Unemployment Insurance Commission	\$890 million
Public Debt Program	263 million
Fiscal Transfer Payments Program	190 million
Hospital Insurance Contributions	114 million
Payments to Rail and Transportation Companies	92 million
Canada Assistance Plan Payments	84 million
Medical Care Contributions	52 million

Increases in voted items, for which Parliament is to be asked for approval, are as follows:

Defence Services	246 million
Accommodation Program	88 million
Post Office	85 million
Development and Utilization of Manpower Program	71 million
International Development Program	41 million
Indian and Eskimo Affairs Program	39 million
Canadian International Development Agency	37 million

In our examination of these estimates this year, your committee departed from its normal procedure and decided to carry out as a test case a more detailed examination of one program. In this case the detailed examination was made of the operations of Information Canada, and attached to the report is a list of the witnesses heard.

This report is the report of the committee, but there will be a supplement in your hands prior to recess, which will be the report of the committee on the subject of Information Canada. As I say, this was a test case and a departure from the former mode of operation of the committee. In the past your committee has examined the estimates, the method of presentation and the general control exerted by Treasury Board over governmental expenditures. We are convinced, however, that the field is just too large to be dealt with successfully by any committee. To do an effective job, it is probable that the best we can do is to make a detailed examination of a department or of a specific program. In future, this is what we propose to do in the committee. When honourable senators see the report on Information Canada, I hope they will be satisfied that this is the correct direction for the committee to take.

There are only two other items in the report with which I should like to deal. They are items 7 and 8. The total cost of government information services was requested from Treasury Board by your committee in its examination of Information Canada. There is provision for over 1,000 information officers in the Government of Canada. At present 600 are employed, and that figure does not include back-up staff such as clerks and stenographers. So, it would appear from the number of people employed that the government information services account for a good deal of the money.

We have suggested that the Treasury Board calculate the total cost of government information services annually, and give it to Information Canada for inclusion in its annual report so that it becomes a matter of public record. We shall deal with that problem fully in the report on Information Canada.

The other area that came to light in the examination of Information Canada, that more correctly should be in this report than in the supplementary report, is the method by which government approves leasing arrangements—that is, leasing of premises for government departments. The final page of the report lists the lease conditions for Information Canada centres in six cities across Canada. Those centres are in Vancouver, Winnipeg, Toronto, Montreal, Ottawa and Halifax. They house book stores and Information Canada Enquiry Centres. If honourable senators look down the leasing terms, they will find that some