

come from consumers from Ontario to British Columbia. It is they who will pay that amount, no matter what they use that oil for, heating purposes or whatever. So that is another tax on heating fuels.

We do not know what this Canadian ownership charge will be, but it will be imposed on all oil and gas consumption in Canada, and that includes heating oil and everything else. There is no attempt in the budget to help lower and middle-income people meet these increased costs. I have given you the figures for what the relief would have been under our budget. I mentioned the figure of \$500 million from the energy tax credit in 1981-82 and another \$1.2 billion for home owners. I referred to relief amounting to \$1,745 million which the ordinary people of this country would have had next year were we still in power, not to mention that the Minister of Finance has copied me—and I am glad that he did—in such progressive moves as permitting Canadians to deduct the salaries of their spouses who are in their own incorporated businesses. This year it will cost \$75 million, and next year it will cost \$160 million. That was a great advance for the PC party and it has nothing to do with the Liberal party. It is just that they followed blindly in April, when they came to office, with the small business development bond.

There is nothing in this budget for small business. The small business development bond was hung up for six months by this government because it could not get the regulations out—it was too busy trying to restrict the bond. The bond was unrestricted in our budget. If a small business borrowed money, it could have interest relief from the small business development bond under our budget. But when it was brought down again in April by the minister, he had it restricted, so now it is only allowed on new capital expenditures and it is hard to get it approved. Even that truncated small business development bond will now be extended for three months only. That is some assistance for small business! It comes from the party which used to pretend it was for small business. They are not for business, small, medium or large, unless they stick their own grubby hands in that business, and then they are for the business.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Crosbie: For any energy policy to be a success in Canada, it has to do two things. First, it has to enhance our national security by getting us to a state of oil self-sufficiency as quickly as possible—a day gained is tremendous for Canada, a month gained is terrific; a year gained is even more terrific. But we have lost a year since last December in getting to oil self-sufficiency. Will it enhance our national security, or are Quebec and the Atlantic provinces to be left at the mercy of the Middle East and the trouble that may erupt there at any time? That is one way by which it can be judged. Second, does it preserve the unity of this country? That is an important principle. I could concoct an energy policy of absolute magnificence if this were a unitary state, and I could impose it on Canadians. But when you are concocting an energy policy which has to suit a diverse nation such as Canada, with the

The Budget—Mr. Crosbie

various regional interests contained within it, it is not so easy. If you concoct a policy and impose it on the provinces, whether they like it or not, if you take some province and strike at its heart and its life blood, get it up against a wall and put a knife right at its stomach, then you are doing nothing for national unity in this country but endangering it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

● (1600)

Mr. Crosbie: Where is agriculture in this budget? Where is the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan)? We saw him flapping his jowls several nights ago. He told us how, when he travelled outside Canada, he came across people in China and around the world who were very worried because Canada did not have its constitution at home. They were afraid that Canada's constitution was endangered over in Westminster, that they were not looking after it properly. He led us to believe that people around the world were gnawing their fingernails to the bone because of this constitutional situation. Where was he when the Minister of Finance concocted this budget?

An hon. Member: In China.

Mr. Crosbie: I want to be corrected by our agricultural experts if I make a mistake. I am not afraid to admit mistakes, I was once a Liberal.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Crosbie: I do not know of any assistance to the agricultural industry. Last year when our budget came down, hon. gentlemen opposite made more noise than a whole barnyard of roosters with only one hen there, because we were not doing enough for agriculture. Well, we gave agriculture a break, with reference to our excise tax. They were to pay a much lower price in agriculture than in other spheres of activity.

An hon. Member: Capital gains.

Mr. Crosbie: Capital gains for farmers. We gave farmers relief in connection with capital gains. Where is it now? We were attacked by members opposite who said we were not doing enough for farmers in connection with capital gains. What is in the budget about capital gains? The Minister of Finance tells us he has had a study done about capital gains and, lo and behold, everything is well with capital gains; nothing should be done to interfere with the capital gains tax, it is a wonderful tax, we are getting wonderful revenues, shaft the farmers as far as capital gains tax or anything else is concerned; we are in power for four years and when four years is over, we will send the Minister of Agriculture around to flapping at the farmers and try to talk them into supporting us again. In this budget he has done nothing to help farmers meet their energy costs, or their other increasing costs.

We saw the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, Robespierre, the hon. Robespierre, get up. It is too bad he did not have his head under his arm; it was still on top of his