

In effect we are asking Canadians today to write a cheque. That is what it comes down to. Senior citizens and people at home, people who have to manage nickels and dimes and dollars, tens of dollars and hundreds of dollars, have great difficulty grasping the idea of \$28 billion. It is unfortunate that people administering those funds are not as careful as our senior citizens and single-parent families in managing their funds. They are not as careful as students at university who are hardly able to get through because of cut-backs in post-secondary education.

To continue to ask Canadians to share this burden, they must believe that the burden is being shared equally and fairly. They also must believe that the money they are paying into the Government or the money the Government is borrowing is being well spent. I think that is where we are falling down on the job.

It was interesting to hear people speak of universality being preserved in this Budget. Sneaking in the back door and attacking anyone who raises the question of the threat to universality on the basis that we are defending people who make between \$50,000 and \$70,000 a year is a neat trick. The fact is that once the threshold is set in, it can be and will be changed just as a result of inflation. Those programs are threatened. It is not fair to say that people making between \$50,000 and \$70,000 a year are being protected. The question is: When will the Government change it?

What will we do with the national sales tax? When the sales tax was introduced, accompanying it was the term "revenue neutral". The Government will implement this new national sales tax on January 1, 1991. The Government undertakes that the tax will be revenue neutral. In the meantime, put the taxes on Canadians: excise; gas; cigarettes; alcohol. Better than that, institute an increase in the manufacturers' sales tax. Billions of dollars are being added in 1989 and 1990 to make sure that when we get into revenue neutral, we have squeezed the well so dry there will be nothing more to take no matter what type of tax is brought in. That is what happens to trust and credibility when people begin to fathom and look through all the rhetoric, thick books, the Estimates and the rest of it. That is what people are beginning to grasp. It is not a question of whether one program should be cut or expanded, whether this tax should be raised of that one reduced, or whether low-income families are being hit harder than middle-income families, or whether high-income families are getting away unscathed. There is a fundamental breach of trust here.

Borrowing Authority

We have heard much talk about Ministers of Finance who should resign or who should not resign or who did resign or who did not resign, depending on the circumstances. In this particular situation, I believe the exercise in terms of the budget leak is one that may be of some interest. It shows up a problem of abuse if insiders were able to take advantage of the leak because they were able to get to their brokers or able to get involved in transactions that helped them out and put them in a position to profit by the leak.

I must give the Minister of Finance the benefit of the doubt. He must have believed what he said last fall about how good things were in Canada. If, after four years of holding the portfolio, he did not know any better last fall than what he was saying, compared to what he is doing to us this spring, that is why he should resign, not because somebody walked out with a Budget or left one somewhere or somebody found one. The problem for the average Canadian is what to do with a leaked Budget that will be passed by this Government? That is the problem for Canadians, not how it happened, who did it or why they did it. It is the attack on the universality of programs. It is the attack on regions of the country.

I was sorry to see the Chairman of the Finance Committee leave. At the very outset, he exhibited an attitude that some people in government have, that we punish people who did not do the right thing on November 21. People in Chatham, New Brunswick, believe that today. People in Summerside, Prince Edward Island, believe that today, that they are being punished. People in Atlantic Canada believe they are being punished because we did return more Members to the left than to the right, more Liberals than Conservatives. We will pay a price because of the attitude of some people who feel that Government and its largess should be directed to those who have supported them.

All of us collectively should find a way to have Canadians believe that there is a commitment to telling them the truth, to telling them what is really happening. Why is it that Canada cannot balance its Budget? Why is it that a tax system appears to be unfair? Why is it that politicians say one thing in September, October and November and then do something else four or five months later? Individuals that I spoke with last weekend were not worried about why the Budget was leaked but, rather, why Parliament did not sit in January, February and March. They wondered if it was specifically arranged to leave as big a gap as possible between the big lie and the harsh reality. That is what it comes down to. Canadians are getting wise. It is not to our advantage to