

Borrowing Authority

He talked about trying to bribe voters. The Conservatives are going to find that is about the only thing left to them. They have tried everything else. I was not talking about bribing voters. He comes up with that from his own assumptions in that way.

When I talk about government Members who will see only good sense when the ballot box sits before them and they realize they are on their way to retirement, I was appealing to their sense of self-preservation. We have had three and a half years of letting ideology rule their lives and determine what they are going to do. It has been such a confining ideology that the Parliamentary Secretary is unable to recognize what I was talking about.

The Government has been pursuing deficit reduction and cutting back on borrowing. The Parliamentary Secretary again wept tears about the fact that it is the payment of interest on the national debt that creates the deficit. It is worth remembering that a good part of the borrowing is investment by Canadian wage earners. I notice the Government used about \$15 billion of its borrowing authority up to the end of January. Of that money, almost two-thirds, if I remember the figures correctly, came from people who bought Canada savings bonds and who were happy to invest in the securities of the Canadian Government.

What I am talking about is not bribing the voters. That is the way those jokers see it. The voters will treat them with the kind of contempt that deserves. I am talking instead about needs existing in every region of Canada, construction needs of various sorts, needs that the Government should be doing something about so that we do not live in the kind of depression this country has experienced in attitudes. Liberals before them and now Conservatives have a depression mentality: hold back on spending, stint everywhere, with terrible end results.

Look at what has happened in education financing. The federal Government failed to be true to the principles that characterized university financing up to the middle 1970s. Provincial Governments, under more and more pressure, have been following through on that, so that when you contemplate what is happening now to people supporting public school education, you see that at one time 60 per cent of the cost of education was provided by the provincial Government. It has slipped down towards 40 per cent. The local ratepayers are burdened with these taxes. We have had that kind of mentality in area after area.

What I am talking about is recognizing that we are not in the interest rate depression of the early 1980s. The Conservatives should be honest enough to recognize that that is what produced the terrible results of the early 1980s, the last Trudeau Government, and provide the background against which there has been further improvement, not particularly to the Government's credit. What the Government has done in loading taxes on Canadians and reducing spending should have kept that depression going as we expected. The feature we did not work in was reasonable interest rates.

The Parliamentary Secretary made suggestions about election spending. My good friend from Windsor—Walkerville pointed out what the developers are doing in supporting aldermen in a completely shameless buying of votes in Toronto City Council. Incredible. Those are the allies of this Government. Those people on the city council have been passing one development after another, destroying the life of downtown Toronto, overburdening the transportation system and so on. If he really wanted to reduce the borrowing needs of this country a little bit he would persuade the Minister of Finance to reduce interest rates. If that were done by just one percentage point he could save \$1.4 billion of those hard-earned tax dollars or additional borrowing that he is so concerned about. That of course is his great concern so why does he not do something about it?

Mr. McCurdy: Madam Speaker, I heard just a portion of the very eloquent speech by my colleague from Thunder Bay—Nipigon. I heard him compare the situation in northern Ontario with that of southern Ontario. I wonder if he would care to reflect upon the tendency not only to, in a manner of speaking, completely ignore the circumstances of northern Ontario, but to include within the context of southern Ontario places such as Windsor where the unemployment rate now has reached 14 per cent. My home city is now tied with Trois-Rivières as the place with the highest unemployment rate in the country. Nevertheless, the Government persists in describing southern Ontario as so prosperous as to be virtual parasites on the rest of the country.

What action should the Government take in recognition of that state of affairs, particularly when anyone who has looked at the record of the economy of this country over the last two decades would understand that if a high unemployment rate occurs in Windsor it reflects the trend to be anticipated in the automobile industry?

Mr. Epp (Thunder Bay—Nipigon): Madam Speaker, I appreciate my colleague giving me the opportunity to draw some of those distinctions. It is very easy for us to think that everything between the Ontario border near Montreal and Windsor is in great shape. The sad reality is that it is not. We are looking at a small area around the Golden Horseshoe, Metropolitan Toronto, where there has been an incredible boom lately. As we move out from there to Windsor and Trois-Rivières, not an insignificant linking of communities and towns in the corridor from Quebec City to Windsor, when those communities are experiencing these unemployment rates, it is clear that the market orientation of the Government and all of its talk about prosperity falls very flat. It clangs upon the ears of people who are sitting around looking for jobs.

I was talking about investment in Canada, investment in this transportation corridor for VIA Rail and other projects designed to get us to full employment. When we get there, let us be sure that we tax fairly and adequately in order to get the