

member wants complete details on it I can give them to him. They are to be found in the estimates. The hon. member indicated earlier that he had not received a copy, but the actual man-year reductions are reflected in the table at the front of the main estimates. I am surprised that spokesmen for the NDP do not have a copy of that table.

Mr. Anguish: Could I ask that I get a copy of these estimates to peruse while the questioning is taking place?

Hon. John C. Crosbie (St. John's West): Madam Speaker, I would like to ask the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Johnston) a question about the oil import compensation fund also. The budget speech of December 11 and the documents attached to that document showed oil import compensation payments in our estimate for the year 1980-81 as \$1,620 billion. That was the predicted cost of the program for 1980-81 based on the oil price scenarios set out in the budget, and the estimate of what imported oil would cost during 1980. Of course, as has been pointed out in the House by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Lalonde), that estimate was based on the price estimated for the year of \$27 and some odd cents a barrel.

The present price of imported oil landed at Montreal is about \$35 or \$36 a barrel, and the estimate is up. In the statement the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance (Mr. MacEachen) made last night it was indicated that the amount of the increase, with higher international oil prices, has raised the projected level of oil import compensation payments by \$1.5 billion. Does that mean that the estimate for this year for oil import compensation payments is now \$3,120 billion, or what is the estimate of the President of the Treasury Board for this year, 1980-81?

Mr. Johnston: Madam Speaker, perhaps I could take this opportunity in response to the hon. member's question to clear up what may be a certain amount of confusion in reconciling the total expenditure projections of the government at this time and the main estimates which were tabled today.

If I refer to the minister's speech of last night, the minister explained the difference between the total expenditure projections of the previous government made in December, and the current expenditure projections we are presenting at this time—those that he presented last night. As he pointed out, the increase in the interest rates on the public debt, and the two increases in international oil prices which occurred after the preparation for the December forecast of expenditures, account in the main for an upward revision of \$2 billion in the projected total expenditures.

If we turn to the main estimates tabled today, Madam Speaker, by coincidence the total main estimates amount to \$58.437 billion, which is approximately the same number as the previous government had forecast in December for total expenditures. These two numbers represent quite different factors, as the hon. gentleman knows. The \$58.4 billion was the total expenditure forecast, whereas the \$58.437 billion represents total authorities to be requested from Parliament at

Main Estimates

the time of tabling of the main estimates, and recognizing that there would be further requirements for supplementary estimates during the course of the year.

The main estimates tabled today are about \$1 billion higher than had been expected by the previous government at the time they deposited their December budget and their total expenditure forecast, to which the hon. gentleman has made reference.

● (1640)

In the main, the approximately \$1 billion increase in the main estimates was due to an adjustment to take into account the first increase in international oil prices which occurred just after the budget was presented and tabled in December, but prior to the finalization of the figures in the main estimates which I have tabled today.

The further adjustments to expected total expenditures have occurred subsequently, have not been included in the main estimates and must be taken into account in providing a realistic forecast of the total expenditures, which is what the Minister of Finance did in his statement last night.

These major additional adjustments, Madam Speaker, are the increase in the public debt cost, the second round of increases in international oil prices and the provision for the increase in the guaranteed income supplement, as I have indicated. Providing for these increases, which have already been identified, plus an allowance to meet further unforeseen requirements for supplementary estimates during the year, results in the forecast presented by the Minister of Finance last night of total expenditures of \$60.4 billion.

I hope that this brief explanation of the coincidence of the two numbers, the two \$58.4 billion amounts, will serve to clear up any confusion in the minds of my hon. friends.

Mr. Crosbie: Madam Speaker, I think I can understand what the President of the Treasury Board is saying, even though he is a tax lawyer. It would help us, though, if he would tell us about the two items that mainly account for this difference. He says they are the interest cost and the oil import compensation payment—the difference between the statement the Minister of Finance made last night, the estimates he has tabled and the guaranteed income supplement.

Could he just tell us—let us forget the estimates he has tabled—what is the latest estimates of Treasury Board which the Minister of Finance must have used last night for interest payments during the year 1980-81? As far as I can make out, it should be around \$10.7 billion. What is the amount that he thinks will be spent on the guaranteed income supplement additional payment in 1980-81—because the Minister of Finance used that figure last night—over and above what already was in the law, assuming the new amendment is passed by the House, which it will be. Also, what does the minister now estimate will be the total cost of the oil import subsidization program this year for 1980-81, given what he now knows about the international price, with only a \$1 increase in January and not counting any increases in the rest of the year