

The Address—Mr. Bigg

whose products are standards of quality. I have a suspicion that it is not only because they put good chocolate into the candy that they are so successful commercially.

We need more honesty in this country; more honest-to-goodness, straightforward honesty. We need it from all sides of this House. I should like to hear the members of the New Democratic party, for example, tell the unions that they are asking too much. It is most confusing to my farmers out west when they find that the reason they cannot ship their wheat is that some hidebound longshoremen's strike is holding up the movement of grain.

An hon. Member: It is the employers.

Mr. Bigg: It has been the fault of the employers at times, as I am the first to admit. It would certainly put the employers on the spot as far as the farmers are concerned if the longshoremen could tell them why they should have a 30-hour week when those same longshoremen are ready to fight against the making of an acreage payment. It seems that when we hear talk about an acreage payment, we hear only a lone voice from the prairie.

Prairie farmers want me to ask why it is that only the farmer is supposed to get along by competing on the markets of the world while others have their incomes guaranteed. I am sure that when my hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition talks about a guaranteed income he is not only thinking about the unemployed and those now receiving relief, but about everybody in Canada including the fishermen who want a fair price for their catch and the farmer who wants a reasonable return for his farm products.

What is the answer to these questions? It is a very complex one. If we want to improve the wheat sales situation it will mean more research; it will mean putting more salesmen on the road. It may mean digging into the taxpayers' pockets so as to give the farmer, one of the hardest working men in Canada, a fair chance to pay for his children's underwear and keep abreast of his taxes.

Only two-thirds of my constituency Mr. Speaker is agricultural in nature. The people in the urban centres are worried about the ever-increasing cost of living in the cities. The newspapers tell us—indeed, they boast about it—that a young man getting married is able to buy an improved lot for \$5,000. I hear one hon. member say "That is cheap". Perhaps it is cheap at present prices. Can anyone tell us how this young man will be able to

[Mr. Bigg.]

pay the enormous education and other taxes which ride ever higher with the price of that property? The school board would, no doubt, be delighted if he had to pay twice as much for a lot, because in that case they would have double the amount to spend on certain forms and frills of education.

The easy answer to this problem is to say that education is not a federal matter, so we can close our eyes to it. Like the need to organize rapid transportation systems, it is not considered a federal matter. Even pollution, I understand, is not considered to be a federal responsibility. Is the air polluted above a city? Then, it is not a federal responsibility. If it were polluted over a provincial highway, then I suppose it would be a provincial matter; if it were polluted over the Trans Canada Highway, or over an interprovincial waterway, I presume we would come into the picture.

We had better get together. When we are rehashing our constitution we ought to bring it up to date so that we can straighten out these matters. When we turn to our legal brains we are told, in most instances, what we cannot do. We are told we cannot discuss certain matters, or that we cannot deal with pollution or certain aspects of public health without permission from the provinces.

• (4:20 p.m.)

The federal government tells the provinces that no money is available, so they need not keep asking for assistance. This is why our small farmers are leaving their homesteads. It is why pollution is becoming so bad that hope for saving some rivers is being abandoned. The bottleneck is a human one. There is no river in Canada that cannot be cleaned up if we start now.

I ask the government why they do not institute a crash program to combat pollution. According to an article I read last night, Canada hopes to get around to dealing with pollution by about 1981. My throat is sore at the present moment, not because I have been shouting but because of that stinking pulp mill just across the river. The capital city of Canada should be an example to the whole country in the matter of pollution control, yet if you have had pneumonia within the last five years you just can't live here. We cannot even breathe the air in this chamber without calling for medical attention. I am afraid if we have to wait until 1981 neither I nor Canada will be in a condition to benefit much from pollution control. We must get down to