

clause and save those \$400 million to \$500 million. Because of the deficit we cannot afford to lose that hunk of change for something that everyone, including the Government, recognizes as being so unproductive.

The Hon. Member mentioned the minimum tax. I congratulate the Government for acting on this provision. We will have to see what type of minimum tax is introduced, whether it is smoke and mirrors or whether it will be a meaningful tax which will make the system a little bit fairer. That we will have to see.

The Hon. Member talks about tax collection. The Government pointed out in the economic statement that it was going to try and collect some \$400 million in taxes that no one disputes are owed to it. In fact, there are some \$4.5 billion in uncollected taxes which are beyond dispute. There are almost \$400 million which the corporate sector has collected from its employees which they have not transmitted to the Government even though they are legally required to do so at the end of each month. For the Government to enforce just that one provision would bring in almost \$400 million, never mind the \$1.6 billion the corporate sector owes but has not yet paid.

The Hon. Member ended his remarks by saying that the Government is committed to letting the private sector do its thing and if we could only do that, prosperity is here. I suggest to him that the economic history of this country and its development is one where the private and public sectors have worked together. There is a tremendous role for the public sector to play, and for this Government to destroy that part of the public sector will be disastrous to this country and the private sector as well.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Questions and comments continue. I recognize the Hon. Member for The Battlefords-Meadow Lake (Mr. Gormley). I ask Hon. Members to keep their questions and comments short as we have only a 10-minute period.

Mr. Gormley: Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond in light of the fact that the Hon. Member for Regina East (Mr. de Jong) and I come from the same province. Several of his statements should be clarified for the record, particularly those dealing with the economic comparisons involving Saskatchewan.

The Hon. Member referred to cults and related activities. The hallmark of a cult is the fact that there has to be a great deal of proselytizing going on and I think the people of Canada chose us to do this. We did not have to do much proselytizing to make people understand the deficit had been running out of control and something responsible had to be done about it. The Hon. Member remarked that somehow changing politics had caused some economic problems in Saskatchewan. If one looks at a comparable period in Alberta, in prosperous times that province was able to build up a very handsome surplus; but Saskatchewan had a balanced budget. However, when the new government had a chance to look at the books it realized that, through some very creative bookkeeping involving Crown corporations and government departments, a true accounting of

the state of the economy had not been given. Given the kind of economics that this Member advocates, then the deficit would be twice as large as it is. I just wanted to comment on the Hon. Member's statement that Saskatchewan's economic difficulties arose because of the change of government. That is not the case.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I am sorry to interrupt the Hon. Member but the period for questions and comments is now over. I ask again that Hon. Members please try and keep their comments and questions short, as we have three other Members who have not been able to speak, the Hon. Member for Simcoe South (Mr. Stewart), the Hon. Member for Erie (Mr. Fretz), and the Hon. Member for Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador (Mr. Rompkey). However, I shall give 30 seconds to the Hon. Member for Regina East (Mr. de Jong) to answer the comment.

Mr. de Jong: Mr. Speaker, we could spend some time debating the situation in Saskatchewan, which debates are of course occurring in the provincial legislature. However, the facts are still very simple and clear: Saskatchewan today has a deficit higher than it has ever been in the history of the province. That deficit has been incurred since the Conservatives have been elected in Saskatchewan. For the Hon. Member to say that they did not have a look at the books gives me a feeling of *déjà vu*. I do not think the people of Saskatchewan buy that and I do not think the people of Canada are going to buy it either. The people of Canada voted overwhelmingly to put the Conservatives into office because they were tired of the Liberals, not because of any of their programs or policies. Those programs and policies did not exist.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The period for questions and comments is now over. I would like to remind Hon. Members of this House that the first two speakers we have had this morning have referred to a specific absence of other Members from the House. I know this was not meant in any critical way but I ask Hon. Members not to refer specifically to the absence of a Member from the House.

We shall now resume debate with the Hon. Member for Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador (Mr. Rompkey).

Hon. William Rompkey (Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador): Mr. Speaker, as the Hon. Member for Trinity (Miss Nicholson) said yesterday, the difficulty we have with this Bill is not so much in and of the Bill itself but that it has come to us all at once. It is hard to assimilate and it takes time to find out exactly what is happening and what the impact of the Throne Speech, the economic statement and now this borrowing Bill is going to be.

We on this side want to take the time to examine it and do two other things. First of all we want to make sure that our people know exactly what government policy is. Then, as their representatives in this House, we want to stand up and say what they would say if they were here. We are their representatives and our job is to say what they would say if they could be here. I want to try and tell the House and you, Mr.