

However, if we were to add up the cost of some of the programs they have proposed over the years, the results would be astronomical. There is, however, a humanity in that party in this respect. On the other hand, the Tory Party has been saying that we must restrain, cut spending in every way and leave things to the private sector. Yet both those parties took the same action and opposed the bill. A better way of putting it would be to say that they filibustered the bill. I think the Liberal Party and the government showed humanity with respect to that bill, but it was humanity with responsibility and that is the role a government must play.

Let us take a look at something a little more recent.

An hon. Member: Otto Lang.

Mr. McRae: There was a motion under Standing Order 43 moved the other day by a member of the NDP which had to do with pensions in the civil service. It had to do with widows' pensions or spouses' pensions, and one of the features of that motion was that spouses' pensions should eventually rise to 100 per cent of the pension of the two people in a given family. That would have amounted to a definite increase in the cost of the civil service and in the cost of civil service pensions. When the vote was taken, the party of restraint, the Tory Party, voted for that motion. They thought that the government should consider granting a pension of 100 per cent of the amount that it would be for both parties to the remaining spouse. Was that an act of restraint? It certainly was not.

Mr. Dick: How about Otto Lang? Is that an act of restraint?

An hon. Member: Order.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. The Standing Orders provide that a member should be allowed to speak without interruption. I suggest that we listen.

Mr. McRae: I would prefer not to get into a long argument, but if we would like to compare—

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order, since there seems to have been an interruption for that purpose. It is also a rule that one cannot reflect on a vote taken in the same session. The hon. member can talk all he wants about what happened last session, but he cannot reflect on a vote which was taken in this session.

Mr. McRae: I can accept that statement. I would like to deal with the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) since some of this occurred in this session. Without getting into a long argument about individual trips—

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Don't be too specific.

Mr. McRae: —in one case we voted for an item which would likely cost something in excess of \$50 million, and in another we are talking about a total government expenditure for a year of \$3 million. There is a difference between \$50 million

Restraint of Government Expenditures
to \$100 million and \$3 million, so without defending Mr. Lang—

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Order.

Mr. McRae: —because I am sure he can defend himself extremely well—

Mr. Mazankowski: He is the Minister of Transport.

Mr. McRae: I am sorry. That is not the way he was referred to by hon. members.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): I suggest that the hon. member refer to all hon members in this House either by their title or by their riding.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McRae: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. I got carried away because I heard the minister's name used often on the other side.

If we are looking for methods of restraint, we should be looking at how governments can restrain themselves. We must look at government spending in toto, the kinds of government spending and the amounts governments spend. Of the \$42 billion, \$43 billion or \$44 billion this fiscal year, which will be the amount the government will likely spend, in round figures 30 per cent of that is used to operate the total government. It provides for the armed forces, the Post Office and all activities of the federal government. It provides all the services for which this government is responsible. Transfer payments account for the remaining 70 per cent. Where do these transfer payments, which amount to over \$30 billion, go? Other levels of government receive 8.1 per cent in the form of the Canadian Assistance Plan, in the form of health and welfare payments and in the form of equalization. There is some feeling in the country that in terms of equalization this all goes to the province of Quebec which, of course, is not true.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Don't be silly.

Mr. McRae: Equalization payments go to seven of the ten provinces. On a percentage basis the Atlantic provinces get the most, and although Saskatchewan and Manitoba also receive some, they get the least.

● (1550)

The second item is payments to individuals totalling about \$9 billion or 23.6 per cent of the total. This is paid in the form of Canada Pension Plan, Old Age Pensions, the Guaranteed Income Supplement and so on. One of the major factors contributing to increased government costs over the last three years has been the need to increase the amount of money going to individuals because of inflation in the economy. We have had to substantially increase old age pensions, widows' pensions, veterans' pensions and so on, and we have had to index them so that the people will have enough money to live on. To say that these are contributing factors to inflation is to say that old age pensioners, veterans and such people are causing