

resources and the use of human labour to produce the things people need to use rather than producing only what will produce a profit for a few.

[Translation]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Questions or comments. The Hon. Member for Lévis (Mr. Fontaine).

Mr. Fontaine: When I listen to the Hon. Member for Spadina (Mr. Heap), Mr. Speaker, I can easily understand why the December 30, 1985 *Globe and Mail's* headline read: Bob White Asked to Lead New Democratic Party. It would appear that current Members do not qualify, so they have to look outside Party ranks. I find it hard to understand why the Hon. Member should speak against this Bill, considering that the socialist Party likes to spend money freely. He ought to be in favour of still more borrowing because their policy has always been to spend more in order to get less. I wonder just how their comments can possibly reflect the philosophy of the socialist Party.

Today, they object to the House granting us money to finance our programs; "yesterday or tomorrow" they will ask the Government, instead of allowing the private sector to create 560,000 new jobs, to increase the number of civil servants on its paylists; yet, they do not want to grant the Government the sums of money required to create these jobs. "Tomorrow or yesterday", they will ask the Government for more programs for needy people, more pensions, more social assistance. Yet, they will not let the Government borrow. We can't afford it. Tomorrow, they will ask the Government to keep a great many civil servants. When it wants to retrain employees and streamline the Public Service, they will object, saying that it would result in 5,000 or 15,000 jobs being lost. Yet today, they do not want the Government to have the money to finance its programs. Where is their philosophy then? Have they anything consistent to say? They will turn their attention to corporations, when the time comes to adopt new legislation. They will ask the Government to impose more constraints on corporations, to increase their costs and reduce their benefits, resulting in a loss of income tax. And they do not want the Government to borrow, while at the same time they want to reduce the income tax. Where is their consistency, Mr. Speaker?

They are going to ask us to expand the Government apparatus. It will be great. Everybody will work for the Government. But where is the money going to come from? And they will still object to the Government's borrowing. What kind of logic is that?

Mr. Speaker, as soon as we have programs to deal with specific problems in business and industry, they will get up and tell the Government: Subsidize the automobile industry, the shipyards, the textile industry and the agricultural industry. They are going to say: Let's pay even more. Where do these socialists think the money is coming from? They don't want us to borrow, and the way they are going, business won't be paying taxes at all. Mr. Speaker, they want business to pay

Borrowing Authority Act

more. When it comes to legislation, they will want business to pay their employees even more. But that means business will not be as motivated, will make less profit and thus pay less income tax. Where is the money going to come from?

What kind of logic is that, my socialist friends? You are in favour of uncontrolled expansion of programs, and you want our businesses to die. Have you ever considered that we need money to finance Government programs? I wish you would explain once and for all what your philosophy is, if you have one. If you do not, I think you should try and disappear from the political map. I hope you succeed.

Mr. Heap: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Hon. Member for Lévis (Mr. Fontaine) for his question.

• (1550)

[English]

I wish the Member had been here at the beginning of my remarks. Perhaps he was, but was busy doing something else. He apparently missed my opening point, that being that I oppose this Bill because of the spending policy of the Government, that of its predecessor, the predecessor of that Government being the Government of the late John Diefenbaker, and that of its predecessors. I oppose the policy of spending primarily to satisfy the whim and greed of the rich rather than to meet the needs of the people.

I am in favour of spending for the needs of the people. I am clear on that. I would be happy to sit down with the Member and talk about what the people need. Hundreds of thousands or millions of Canadians lack basics such as food, clothing, and a place to live where they won't freeze in the winter. We need a program in Canada to find out what people in Canada need, how to meet those needs, and how to divide the work up among ourselves. I would be happy to discuss that with the Hon. Member for Lévis (Mr. Fontaine) at any time.

I have spoken against a policy which ignores human need. Instead, we say that if we give money to the rich, some day the rich, including the blabbermouth who is standing in the aisle and interrupting me, will let some of that money come down to the poor. I wish the Hon. Member had not totally missed the point of what I was saying.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: It's "Mr. Blabbermouth" to you.

Mr. MacDougall: Mr. Speaker, could the Member inform the House whether the policy of the New Democratic Party in the next election campaign will be to cut wages of workers all across the country? Does the Member think that rather than an increase in wages, Canadian workers should experience a decrease in wages? Is that the new policy of the NDP?

Mr. Heap: Mr. Speaker, the New Democratic Party will not be asking for a wage cut. We will be asking, as we have in the past, for a selective degree of control on prices. The power of a few companies to raise prices without any competition or negotiation, as Bell Telephone is doing, is almost unlimited.