

for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie). In introducing his budget he placed before the people of Canada an energy plan which, in my opinion, he did not really understand. He could not conclude an agreement with the producing provinces which prior to the election would have been very easy to accomplish. The energy tax proposed in that budget was not fully enumerated. The proposed national energy bank's objectives were vague at best.

Of course, when it came to research and development across this country we had the hon. member from St. John's West indicating that his plan of action was to engage in further studies of tax incentives. The Crosbie way—if I may call it that—to increase employment opportunities was to reduce the deficit or, better yet, to provide more incentives to the private sector and, particularly, to his good friends the multinationals. His best move, which every member of this House recalls very well, was the imposition of an 18-cent excise tax on gasoline. We know what the people of Canada thought about that.

The budget before us addresses these questions very clearly. On behalf of my constituents I would indicate what the differences are, particularly as they affect the farmers and fishermen in my constituency. For instance, under the Crosbie budget diesel fuel in 1981 would cost \$1.19 per gallon, while under our budget it will cost \$1.06 per gallon. In 1982 the cost under the Crosbie budget would have been \$1.36 as compared to \$1.23 under our budget. In 1983, the cost under the Crosbie budget would have been \$1.88 as compared to \$1.41 under our budget. In 1984 the price per gallon for diesel fuel under the Crosbie budget—

Mr. Gustafson: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Dingwall: Mr. Speaker, I will permit a question at the end of my remarks, if there is time.

In 1984 the price per gallon of diesel fuel under the Crosbie budget would have been \$2.27, and under our national energy program it will be \$1.63. That is a difference of 64 cents.

With respect to gasoline, the price per gallon under the Crosbie budget, back in 1979, was \$1.56, and under our program it will be \$1.36 in 1981. The figures for 1982 are \$1.75 under the Crosbie budget and \$1.53 under ours, for 1983 under the Crosbie budget \$2.32, and \$1.71 under ours. For 1984, under the great paragon and defender of the little guy, the price was to be \$2.63 as compared to our \$1.95, a 68-cent difference.

● (1650)

The fiasco does not end there, it goes on to the price of natural gas at the Toronto city gate. Under the 1979 budget introduced by the hon. member for St. John's West, in 1980 the price would be \$2.75 while our price is, unfortunately, \$2.90. But when we come to 1981 the price under the Conservative budget would be \$3.45 whereas our price will be

The Budget—Mr. Dingwall

\$3.05. Then we go on to 1984 when the price under the Crosbie budget would be \$7.90 while our price under the national energy program is \$4.60. There is a difference of \$3.30. Shame on the hon. member for St. John's West!

Mr. Siddon: Full of deceit.

Mr. Dingwall: Of course this endless barrage on the Canadian public continues with crude oil prices. In 1981 the Conservatives proposed under their budget a price of \$25.20 per barrel. Our price is \$24.90. For 1983 their proposed price was \$46.70, whereas our price is \$34 per barrel, a substantial difference. Of course for 1984, the hon. member for St. John's West who talks about defending the little guy and who worries about the low-income Canadian, set the price of crude oil per barrel at \$55.30. Under our proposal the price in 1984 will be \$40.50 per barrel. There is a difference of \$15.20.

Mr. Siddon: You are misleading the public.

Mr. Dingwall: That is the price of the great defender of the little guy.

Mr. McDermid: That will be thrown back at you in the next election, my friend. Be very careful.

Mr. Dingwall: Obviously, Mr. Speaker, I have shaken a few nerves of members on the opposite side.

The national energy program is of particular importance to the economy of Nova Scotia. The Government of Canada will act to resolve regulatory issues so that the construction of the natural gas pipeline extension through Quebec into the maritimes may begin as soon as possible. The pipeline will be reversible. The government will involve itself in the construction of the main line if necessary. The Government of Canada has provided a sum of \$500 million to be set aside for that particular purpose.

I was interested to hear the comments of the hon. member for Central Nova (Mr. MacKay) who has now left the chamber. However, he did not refer to the comments and the position taken by the Premier of New Brunswick on this particular pipeline. The hon. member talked about his own premier, John Buchanan, but he made no mention of the Premier of New Brunswick or of his comments on this particular pipeline.

Under the national energy program, grants will be provided for conversion or replacement of oil fired heating systems to enable home owners and businesses to use natural gas, propane, wood, solar or other regional appropriate fuels. At least initially conversions to electricity will not be eligible, since much of it is generated from oil.

Mr. McDermid: Not in Ontario.

Mr. Dingwall: The taxable grants will cover 50 per cent of conversion costs up to a maximum grant of \$800. Some 200,000 homes in Nova Scotia are currently oil heated. The program target is the conversion of at least 171,000 homes by the year 1990. In the transportation sector grants of \$400 per