

tion, instead of this weird concoction of the Prime Minister's, which is not our constitution but a bundle of new principles that he wants the British Parliament to pass for us so Canadians will not get a clear sense of what is happening.

The same kind of thinking underlies this budget, Mr. Speaker. The government campaigned on a promise to keep energy costs lower than those in the Crosbie budget, and it has the gall to suggest that it has kept those promises. I would like to draw attention to certain aspects of the budget where the government has broken its promises and betrayed the faith of those who were asked to elect it.

There are many issues I would like to touch on in this budget but one area I do not want to neglect is agriculture. Agriculture should not be neglected by any government in Canada, considering that fully one-quarter of our jobs comes from the food production sector. Yet agriculture is neglected by this government and this budget. Even worse, the very promises upon which this government campaigned for the votes of farmers in Canada have been betrayed. Let me quote the words of the present Minister of Agriculture when he sat in opposition last year. He said, as reported in *Hansard* at page 238, for October 16, 1979, the following:

—I say that in any country you want to check in the world—

And the hon. member continued:

—those who neglect agriculture make the rest of society suffer for that.

These words are wise and true. Everyone eats, and pays increased prices when the cost of food production rises. Yet this government has neglected agriculture, that very sector which the minister said we should not neglect.

Farmers are not fools. They noted the Liberal campaign promise to exempt fuels used in food production from excise tax. They will also note that the main effect of that exemption will be not so much to protect them as to protect consumers from the increase in food costs that would have been passed on. When farmers look at what this budget means to their own pocketbooks, they will see that over the next three or four years farmers will be paying the same increases for fuels for their personal use that all other Canadians are paying. For reasons I shall come to, farmers may well find themselves at a disadvantage compared with urban Canadians because they live beyond the range of natural gas lines.

The Minister of Agriculture when he was in opposition, as reported in *Hansard* for October 16, 1979, said that the cost of land had risen by 14 per cent the previous year, and he added, referring to the Clark government:

This, in itself, underscores the tremendous need for increased funding of the Farm Credit Corporation. This government should practise what it preaches and put up the money for an industry which benefits all Canadians. It is ripe for expansion.

The minister is back in office, Mr. Speaker, and the industry is still ripe for expansion. The minister was right when he said that if agriculture is neglected the whole of society suffers. But the minister has apparently had no effect in trying to convince his cabinet colleagues not to neglect agriculture.

The Budget—Mr. Cardiff

Where is the extra money for the Farm Credit Corporation which the minister urged our government to find? The legislation to increase funding was ready two years ago when the minister was last in office. He helped defeat our government before we could bring it in, though he demanded it be brought in. Where is it now? Young farmers who would like to keep on farming are finding themselves unable to get credit to buy land. The minister takes pride in the favourable rates offered under the Farm Credit Act, but favourable rates mean nothing if the money is not there to lend.

This leads me to another point. In the Crosbie budget provision was made to allow small businesses to issue development bonds which would cut their cost of borrowing in half. Small business creates the vast majority of jobs in Canada. Both small business and the hundreds of thousands of Canadians unemployed need this provision. After defeating the Crosbie budget the present government reintroduced this provision in the April 21 mini-budget which was sneaked into the throne speech debate. This measure, after all, made sense, and was necessary if small business was to go on creating jobs. But legislation to give legal effect to this provision has never been introduced in this House. As a result, banks are unwilling to take up such bonds without a guarantee from the small business issuing them that they will pay the full commercial lending rates, or even more, if the government reneges on its commitment.

Therefore, small businesses are afraid to issue these bonds, for no business can afford to operate in that climate of risk under a government which has broken so many other promises. If the government were really serious about making this provision of the Crosbie budget available and usable, it would bring in the legislation giving it effect. Instead, it has announced a three-month extension of the period within which bonds can be issued. Thus a measure which is presently hampered by a lack of the confirming legislation is going to be hampered for a longer time than originally announced. The question is: when is it going to be made effective? This is the same kind of window-dressing and illusion as the Minister of Agriculture's farm credit, which is advertised at a favourable rate but is not available and usable.

Let me touch briefly on another aspect of the budget which will affect all Canadians when they buy their food, heat their own homes or rent heated homes, when they drive their cars, and when they take buses or trains. That is the aspect of fuel prices. Most Canadians accept the fact that fuel prices must rise. Of course, the price of everything dependent on fuel will rise too.

This budget does two things which will make it more difficult for a great many Canadians to cope with increased fuel costs than the Crosbie budget did. First of all, it eliminates the energy tax credit which would have amounted to \$220 a year for the typical low or middle-income earner in my riding. Second, it builds in a number of incentives to encourage a switch from heating with oil to heating with natural gas, but it gives no help to those who cannot get access to that gas.