

Every thoughtful person would honour those who work diligently and loyally throughout their mature years. We should honour that work, respect and commitment. Hopefully those Members will later today stand up and oppose this odious, unfair and iniquitous piece of legislation.

**Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg-Assiniboine):** Mr. Speaker, we are debating Bill C-133 this afternoon, which is a Bill to amend the Supplementary Retirement Benefits Act. I would suggest that the Liberal Government is working in reverse. There are other areas upon which the Liberal Government should be focusing its sights. This Government should eliminate waste and mismanagement within the federal Government. By eliminating the waste and mismanagement which is in the billions and billions of dollars, then inflation will drop and indexing will look after itself. We will not have to worry about indexing once we get Government spending under control. The federal Government here could well look to the Province of Manitoba as to how it pays for its indexing. The Roblin Government set up a plan a number of years ago whereby pension moneys are invested to cover the indexing for civil servants in Manitoba. All the indexing comes from the investment of their funds, not from taxes or from general revenues. It is one of the best pension plans in Canada, and it is unfortunate that the federal Government did not implement a similar plan.

● (1600)

To give some examples of waste, where we could start is by considering the document I have in my hand which has just been widely distributed across Canada. It is a transcript of the Prime Minister's (Mr. Trudeau) broadcast to the nation on the economy. There was absolutely no need for this document to be printed. No one is interested in it. It is just an absolute waste of money. In the broadcast, the Prime Minister said:

Of course I am concerned about waste, very concerned. Where we find it, we will weed it out.

Those were empty, meaningless words. The man does not mean what he says and he never has since he took over the country in 1968. We have heard these statements starting in 1968, and we are hearing them in 1982. He does not mean what he is saying because if he did, he would not allow a document like this to be printed and distributed because it will just end up in the trash-can.

Repeated reference has been made to the Joyal-Davey Report on the six and five progress. It is the most expensive Liberal householder that has been put out in Canadian history. It is just propaganda. It is not required. It is costing hundreds of thousands of dollars, and it is simply not needed.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. McKenzie:** The Government should pay more attention to the Report of the Auditor General of Canada to the House of Commons.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

### *Supplementary Retirement Benefits Act (No. 2)*

**Mr. McKenzie:** We receive this Report every year, but the only difference between last year's and this year's Report is that this one is worse than last year's. They never get any better. The Liberals have been in office since 1968 and they have no intention of eliminating waste, Mismanagement and duplication. They simply have no intention of doing it, and one must simply read this document to find that out, because it gets thicker every year, not thinner, and the horror stories mount up.

The Auditor General pointed out that about \$16 billion is missing some place. An article in the Ottawa *Citizen* dated November 2, 1982, states:

Auditor General Kenneth Dye has again proved that this federal Government is at worst not competent to manage money, and at best reluctant to let us know how they handle it.

That is the understatement of the year. So, what are we doing? We are debating a Bill to cut pensions and retirement benefits. The Government is starting at the wrong end. That is easy. Anyone can go out and cut pensions. But why does it not implement the recommendations in the Auditor General's Report? I have not heard any Liberals discuss that.

I have in my hand a research paper which is full of horror stories within the Liberal Government. I would simply like to read a couple of the examples for the records. One states:

Spending "Cut" by Juggling the Books. In order to present the illusion of slower spending growth, the Government has changed its accounting system by netting out petroleum taxes against petroleum compensation payments. Thus, through a wave of an accountant's magic wand, spending on a public accounts basis is "cut" by \$2.7 billion in the current (1981-82) fiscal year.

That is an example of the type of bookkeeping of these Liberal Governments. I guess that in order to account for this \$2.7 billion, the Government will reduce old age pensions. The item continues to read:

Perhaps the next accounting trip of the Government will be to say that "income taxes are really a public debt tax, and as such interest on the debt does not cost the Government anything." The logic of this is the same as the logic used by the Government in saying that it does not cost anything to subsidize imported oil.

That statement came from a Progressive Conservative research analysis based on the 1981 budget. That is an example of juggling the books. I say: never mind juggling the books; start balancing the books and start spending the money properly.

The classic example of horror stories is found in Public Works. It just goes on and on. There is absolutely no control in Public Works. We have empty offices all over the place. Petro-Canada has skyscrapers in Calgary which are full of empty offices and it is building another skyscraper. There is absolutely no need for Petro-Canada to be building any more skyscrapers or to be obtaining any more office space. The Government could reduce the amount of office space it has instead of starting to cut old age pensions and retirement benefits.

With reference to Bill C-133, I would like to point out the average pension income for retired Government workers. It amounts to \$6,900 for retired workers and their survivors, and old age pension adds another \$2,963. The national average