

CPP and OAS benefits which he advocates could cost at least \$7.7 billion extra in the first year after implementation. The annual amount to be expended would increase and not decrease in the long run. At the same time the alterations to our social and economic structures which are implicit in the motion might very well lessen our ability to pay the cost.

If time permitted it would certainly be worth-while reviewing the extent to which these programs have been improved in our lifetime, particularly in the last several years, but I shall not deal with that aspect, since I believe the facts are well known. I shall conclude by saying that, having regard to the progress which has been achieved and the concerns so often expressed about the necessity for restrained public expenditure, we might ask ourselves whether we ought really to be prepared to consider the enormous expenditure which is required to provide the increased benefit proposed in the motion. However laudable the motion of the hon. member who made this proposal, this is an aspect which cannot be ignored.

● (1752)

I realize there are other points which need to be brought out, but I wish to give an opportunity for some of my hon. friends, for example, the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Railton) and the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Foster), to make their contributions.

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, the motion before us calls for the pension to be payable at the age of 60 in the case of people not in the work force and for retirement at 65, pensioners to receive \$300 a month. We have just heard from the Civil Service why they cannot go along with this proposal. It is unfortunate we cannot hear some of the Liberal members explain why they cannot support it.

The hon. member for Halton (Mr. Philbrook) says that if the motion were accepted taxes would have to be increased. We did not hear one word from him about the possibility of cutting out wasteful federal expenditure, such as spending money on unnecessary airports, spending \$1 billion a year on consultants' fees to no purpose—I have the figures for 29 departments—or contracting out work to retired civil servants and others at a loss of \$130 million a year. There are many such areas which could be reviewed. We might not be able to find all the money that is involved here, but there are a lot of places where we could find money for increasing pensions and lowering the retirement age.

We in the Conservative party proposed \$200 at age 60 during the last federal election, and we knew where the money was coming from. I shall not be the one to talk out this bill. I hope the Liberal who talks it out will speak from the heart and not stand up to read a statement from some civil servant telling us why this motion cannot be accepted.

Mr. S. Victor Railton (Welland): Mr. Speaker, I was interested to hear the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. McKenzie) say that if the Conservatives were in power they would find the money—that they knew where it was coming from. That is a bold assertion, given the present state

of the world economy. I doubt very much they would know where the money would come from, whether they were in power or not.

First I should like to congratulate the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), who has always been a great advocate of increased pensions not only for senior citizens but for veterans and widows. I praise him for his efforts. However, somebody has to sit in final judgment and be responsible for taking decisions. It is all very well to talk about giving things away, but unless the money is there first, you cannot do it. I am a great believer in Utopia, or I used to be—I believe it to be an unlikely prospect, now. It would be nice to provide everyone with the same standard of living on retirement. But we have heard the remarks of the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Philbrook); I think he made it perfectly clear that much as we would like to do many of these things we are finding it financially impossible.

In the July issue of *International Realities* there is an article showing that the British government has just come through a crisis brought on by excessive rises in wages, heavy social security payments, and free health services. It was generally thought that high unemployment was due to all the taxation and the undue reduction of legitimate business profits. Canada and the United States have been following the U.K. downward slide because the number of jobs in the private sector has been decreasing while the number of employees in all areas of government at all levels has been steadily increasing. The number of people working at productive jobs is too small to provide for all the government employees, for government make-work programs, and for a generous social security system. In other words, we are faced with the need to reduce government expenditures and the ratio of government employees to those in the market place. We shall have to improve the profitability of the private sector in order to pay for even the measure of social security we presently enjoy.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hour for the consideration of private members' business has now expired.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

POST OFFICE—REQUEST FOR ASSURANCE SURVEILLANCE OF
MAIL NOT PERMITTED

Mr. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, one of the most impressive sights I have had the opportunity of observing in the question period took place on November 9 when I raised the question of the surveillance of mail by agencies of the federal government. We were given the specta-