

Business of Supply

The Chairman: Order, please. I want to bring it to the attention of the hon. member that he rose on a point of order and I am here to rule on it. I have to refer him to Standing Order 55 which indicates that there is no limitation of time on the presentation of the Prime Minister. If hon. members have made other agreements not within the knowledge of the chairman of the committee, there is no way I can rule other than to have the right hon. Prime Minister speak.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: As the chairman well knows, we have been operating on a 15-minute basis. There was discussion today about whether we wanted to speak first or whether the Prime Minister would speak first. We want the opportunity to have a discussion, not a monologue, Mr. Chairman. I leave it to the Prime Minister's personal judgment, but I would remind him that we have been operating on a 15-minute basis. He has taken about 35 minutes. In view of the fact that he cannot stay long—and I understand why he cannot—I would ask him to bear this in mind.

The Chairman: Order, please. I understand very well the point raised by the Leader of the Opposition. The 15-minute time limit which was agreed upon last week was for the two days' examination of the estimates of the Department of Transport. No agreement about today's proceeding has reached the chairman of the committee. At one time or another I expect the House leader will bring forward some proposal, but it was brought to my attention that the period until 4.30 would be preceded by a statement by the Prime Minister. Nobody mentioned that it would be limited as to time. It was to be followed by a question period. I am ready to accept any agreement that can be made within the committee or by hon. members, but I cannot impose rules that do not exist.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Chairman, I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that these are not important questions. Unfortunately, the questions which have been raised consistently by hon. members opposite are those which make the headlines. Since we are on spending, I intend to take a few more minutes on this subject. That seems to be an unimportant part, but it seems to be the position of hon. members opposite.

● (1540)

In the very next phrase, the right hon. gentleman from Prince Albert said, "Neither did we have any armoured dreadnoughts." I will not go into the explanation which has already been given by the Solicitor General to do with the armoured car which the RCMP put at my disposal, and at the Queen's disposal when she comes here. I just remember, when the right hon. gentleman suggests that possession of this car shows signs of paranoia on my part, that it was he who, at substantial public expense, had the bomb-shelter built at 24 Sussex Drive. Perhaps he was looking ahead to the time at the Chateau Laurier when his party would be kicking at him. The point is that he had that bomb-shelter built at substantial public expense. He had built a whole series of government facilities out at Carp in which to house himself and the government if any violence should overtake him. I think it was a bit petty of

[Mr. Cossitt.]

him to refer to the armoured car when he, himself, was a particularly visible case of paranoia.

In the same speech, the right hon. gentleman talked about Harrington Lake. I think that was another unfortunate reference, because I suppose he made the largest land grab when he was in office that was ever made by any private citizen of Canada. He did so when he decided that Harrington Lake and the buildings on it should be the country residence of the prime minister. I do not think anybody then sitting on my party's side of the House criticized that decision. He was adding thousands of acres of land for his private enjoyment. I think it was a justifiable gesture, one from which I personally have benefited. In the same way I hope the next prime minister will benefit from the swimming pool at 24 Sussex Drive. There is a difference: I do not intend to stock the swimming pool with fish, not even sharks, Mr. Chairman.

An hon. Member: What about stocking it with the government's dirty laundry.

Mr. Trudeau: The right hon. gentleman from Prince Albert liked fishing and had Harrington Lake stocked at public expense with fish for his enjoyment.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Trudeau: That was a shameful incident. It is, I repeat, a petty point; unfortunately it was brought out in the speech of the right hon. member for Prince Albert. I am sure he will find other occasions to answer me, but the facts are as I have stated them, Mr. Chairman.

I now come to the more basic question to do with the size of the Prime Minister's office and of the Privy Council office. Here, again, I want to make two points. First, one must make sure facts are accurate. It is necessary, when looking at statistics, to compare things which are comparable. Second, I hope to show in my speech why the Prime Minister's office and the Privy Council office have grown to their present size.

Let us look at the Prime Minister's residence. In 1960-61, seven man-years were utilized. This was in the time of the right hon. member for Prince Albert. The figure remained the same for almost 15 years. Expenditures for 1974-75 were still for seven man-years. The cost, of course, had gone up considerably, from \$26,000 to \$84,000, which means that the same number of men and women who were hired at 24 Sussex Drive had had their salaries increased threefold in 15 years. I do not set salaries there, but I think it is important to keep in mind the number of man-years utilized at the prime minister's residence.

Comparisons as between the Prime Minister's office and the Privy Council office are much more difficult to make, for the simple reason that the two were not separated until the 1971-72 estimates. The number of man-years and costs allocated related to the combined offices, although they then performed a very different function and were covered by estimates of a very different quality. I will give some examples of what I mean; I cannot give them all.

Back in 1962-63, when the Conservatives still were clinging to power, the Prime Minister's office and Privy Council office were allocated 99 man-years at a cost of \$611,000-odd. I have seen hon. members opposite and mem-