

Withholding of Grain Payments

Mr. Bigg: You may cheer, but let me ask those who are cheering this rhetorical question: Can you promise me that the Royal Canadian Mounted Police will remain in its present position even until 1973? Or will it be part of a non-force with a non-commissioner fitting into a plan for non-freedom? I was not only a policeman and a soldier I was trained in the law. If the Attorney General of Canada does not know the law of Canada let me presume to tell him. Everybody in this country is subject to the law which we make and which we alone have the right to alter.

I hope I never again hear about shortcuts. A shortcut in the law of Canada should be a shortcut to the penitentiary, and the flouting of Canadian law as in this case, represents a breaking of the oath of office of a cabinet minister. I do not know what name to put to it, but thinking of the sacrifice made by our boys 30 years ago I am led to wonder how many cabinet ministers shot down German planes? Think of the contribution of those soldiers compared to that of those who would legalize abortion or allow pot to be used everywhere?

● (1:10 a.m.)

We have come a long way during the last 30 years. Our heroes have new faces, but they are not faces that would ever convince me I should bow down and worship them. If my leader on this side of the House tried to do to the people of Canada what is being done openly and brazenly through this legislation, then I would condemn him. Not only do I not hesitate to take that stand but I would be ashamed to do anything else. Tell that to the rest of your boys.

Mr. Woolliams: There are not many here tonight.

Mr. Bigg: The plan has misfired and those behind closed doors are looking for an election excuse. They are not satisfied with 150 seats; they have to manufacture an excuse to go to the people of Canada and ask them for an extended mandate. Why do they do this when they could not do less than they have done in the last three years?

Mr. Woolliams: They promised nothing and delivered it.

Mr. Bigg: Yes, they promised nothing and sure lived up to their promise. Now, they are trying to panic the country into a premature election. They have another two years to go and they have a majority. If they have the brains, the sharpened wits and all the answers, then let them come up with a little action.

Mr. Lang: Do you want us to go five years?

Mr. Bigg: I do not want you to go one more day. Liberal times are good times—for Liberals.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Bigg: You live and learn, Mr. Speaker. These hon. members applaud too soon. The wheat farmers of western Canada do not think Liberal times are good times. The average net income of a prairie farmer three years

[Mr. Bigg.]

ago was \$4,800 a year in round figures. In the year 1969-70, it was \$1,200 in round figures. This does not take into consideration the drop in purchasing power of the dollar.

During the last year we have been told inflation has been beaten. It may be beaten for the Liberals, but it is not beaten for anyone else in this country. Perhaps the 7 per cent increase is sufficient for some people, but I am not one of them. I want to know when these good times are going to come and when participatory democracy will mean something. When will the Liberal cabinet consult its own backbenchers? I want to know how it is that this arrogant minister can predict that Bill C-244 will go through this House. He must have resurrected Mr. Pickersgill's crystal ball. Let me tell him that Bill C-244 is not going to go through this House unamended, any more than the former bill C-197, now resurrected as Bill C-176, will go through.

Ministers of the Crown are now boasting about this amended bill and how helpful it is going to be. It is hardly palatable amended as it is, yet they are already boasting about it.

The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) said to me in this House: "Trust us to pass the bill and everything will be fine". How can we trust this ministry when a minister of the Crown says that although the law contains a certain provision if the government wants to do otherwise they can take little shortcuts? Is that not what the minister said? Have the "blues" been corrected? That statement should appear in *Hansard* or I will be up in the question period tomorrow asking why the minister did not leave it in. He said it and we all heard it. It had better be there. In my opinion, to allow him to resign would be a miscarriage of justice. He should be impeached. He is an Oxonian and he knows his history. He would not have dared to do this in the days of Burke and Pitt, and I would like to think that when history is written historians will be able to say he did not dare do it in the days of Woolliams and Mazankowski either. This may well go into the history books as a very historic occasion. I would like to think that we will win this debate and that members on the other side have enough guts to come over here and join us, because if the standards which we have heard expressed in the House tonight are the standards of the Liberal party there should not be an election. They should be ashamed to be members of the House. If that is an exaggeration, you will hear about it and I suppose I will hear about it. However, I will tell you something about the people of Pembina. They like clear, unvarnished truth and they will get it from me.

It is a big game we are playing here tonight; it is a serious game. I have spent my whole life preparing myself for it, and the chips are blue and the stakes are high. The stakes are the future of democracy and freedom in Canada, because if we let this thing go, what will it be tomorrow? There will be another little short-cut through the tax act, another little effort at the emasculation of the mounted police through the creation of a non-force? How do you protect yourself from that sort of