

Income Tax Act

Mr. Bigg: Mr. Chairman, Canada is facing a crisis in agriculture. At a time when we would expect sense from some of our best agricultural brains—I understand we have no less than 40 PhD's in Ottawa working on the problem of agriculture—and to be led out of the morass of bureaucracy and into some common sense, we are being led into a whole mess of socialistic nonsense. I do not blame the Minister of Finance.

Mr. Woolliams: I do.

Mr. Bigg: The Minister of Finance is nothing but a Little Sir Echo of his leader. The Minister of Finance is a genial gentleman but I find nothing genial in the words of his master. I hold in my hand the new gospel of the Liberal party according to Pierre Elliott Trudeau. The book is entitled "Federalism and the French Canadians". It is not written about French Canadians; it is written about the complete take-over of Canada by a carefully thought out strategy and carefully worked out tactics. I will not spend all my time referring to this book. I just want to introduce it to you, Mr. Chairman, and through you to the committee.

On page 124 we find a chapter on the practice and theory of federalism. Our minister's leader sets out in minute detail how to destroy not only agriculture but most of our democratic institutions by masterful use of socialistic strategy. He himself does not pretend to have invented this method. On page 125 he quotes no less an authority on the subject than one Mao Tse-tung. We read the following statement at the bottom of the page with regard to strategy and tactics:

The revolutionary bases, in spite of their insignificant size, are a great political force and strongly oppose the power of Kuomintang—

Take out "Kuomintang" and put in "the power of the federal government." Of course, when this was written he was not the federal government; now he is. It continues:

—which spreads over vast regions—

Instead, put "from ocean to ocean, our great and beloved Dominion".

Revolution and revolutionary wars proceed from birth to development, from small to large, from lack of power to seizure of power—

This is not an old book; it was reprinted in 1968 on the eve of the taking over of the leadership of the Liberal party by our Prime Minister—the leader of the Liberal party not the socialist party. I do not think the Liberals themselves have read the book and they do not know in what camp they are. But I beg you, Mr. Chairman, and every member of the House, to get a copy of this book. It costs only \$2.50. It is a good investment. If you read it you will probably find what one or two members of your party have done since they read it. They had to decide whether they belonged to the right or to the left.

What has this to do with Bill C-259? I will tell you what it has to do with it. Bill C-259 is a small step toward tax reform but it is a tremendous leap forward toward complete and utter socialism in Canada. The confusion is rampant and it is not accidental, it is planned confusion. We are told on the one hand to make agriculture viable, to enlarge farms and to incorporate. What happens then?

[Mr. Peters.]

According to this bill, if you incorporate you will lose the power to average your income.

At a time when agriculture is sagging, when world markets are down and when world prices are down, what do we find? We find the 40 experts on agriculture slavishly writing nonsense at the behest of the socialist Prime Minister, nonsense which is slavishly put in by the Minister of Finance who himself does not know the purport of his own bill. To prove it I may point out that we have more than 100 amendments to the bill. The bill, the child, was dead before it was born. I say it is a good thing. Should it be revived? No, it should never be smacked on the bottom. The people who wrote the bill should be smacked on the bottom and it is our constant desire to smack that bottom until it is beautifully red, as red as that which lay behind the idea that agriculture should be taken out of the hands of individuals and free entrepreneurs in Canada and, instead, run by bureaucracy.

There might be an argument in favour of this bureaucratic running of Canadian agriculture if it in fact meant cheaper food for the Canadian people. But what has happened since the government took over the running of agriculture? We find prices going higher and higher. Butter has gone up four or five cents a pound. It is so high that the working people of Canada from whom we hear constant complaints can no longer afford one of the basic products of this country and we have to import butter.

• (9:20 p.m.)

In this process, what have we done to the small farmer, to the little housewife on the farm who used to have a broken cream jug on the mantelpiece in which she put her Christmas money and from which she took money to help her husband buy twine at threshing time? She can no longer go to the cream jug because apparently we have agreed that we want largeness and efficiency; we want the corporate farm. Yet in this bill, even though the government wants larger farms its avowed policy is to make sure that even if farms become larger they cannot make a great corporate profit.

Mr. Danson: Everybody can have a bigger jug.

Mr. Bigg: I know what I am talking about. There are several thousand small farmers in my constituency whose wives have a little, broken cream jug somewhere. But now there is nothing in the jug and they are worried. The answer is not for them to move to Edmonton, Calgary or any other city and try to make a living there.

One of my dreams from childhood has been that when I finished being a policeman, a soldier and a Member of Parliament I could get a piece of land and help the little woman fill that little cream jug until it was time to buy Christmas presents for the children or grandchildren. But I have not seen in this bill, nor in any bill that has come before this House in the last seven years, anything that provides the small farmer with the kind of security he once had. There is nothing in this bill that offers the small farmer one bit of relief.

On Friday I begged, on behalf of the small businessman, for a chance for the woman who helps him behind the counter. I begged that he be given a little tax relief. I would like to see in this bill some small step forward in