

way to sell agricultural products, whether or not they are turned into protein products, to the nations of the earth. I know it can be done, should be done and must be done. It is not good enough to say that nothing can be done about agriculture. Something that can be done is to give the small farmers of Canada an acreage payment right now. If such a payment were based on the cost of living at the time we established the first acreage payment in 1959, it would have to be doubled today. Even \$400 would help a lot. This plan would not involve any administration costs whatsoever because all that would be needed would be a permit book. If the government wants to waste a lot of money on administration, this can be done but it is not necessary.

One or two Acts respecting agriculture on the statute books could be changed. Instead of waiting until the farmer gets his grain in the bin, money could be lent to him according to the acreage he hopes to get into the bin. Why wait until there is a disaster? Why not allow the man a little credit in order to get the stuff out? I know many farmers in northern Alberta would hire a grain drying machine if they had the cash to do so. They are stymied, although a few hundred dollars would make all the difference between going on relief and being able to carry on.

• (4:10 p.m.)

I have seen news in the papers recently which alarms me. It seems we are not consulted any more in Canada; we are told what is going to be done. Some of the things we are told make my hair stand on end. Take this idea that the government should buy up all the unproductive land in Canada. I do not agree with that. What is unproductive land, anyway, and who is going to decide what constitutes unproductive land? This idea sounds like socialism to me and I do not expect it to come from the great Liberal party; I expect it to come from people who admit being devoted to socialism. It might work, though I do not think it would. But be honest about it. Do members opposite want to socialize land in Canada? If they do, let them say so, and let the electorate vote them in if it approves. Let them not do it behind closed doors and let them not socialize certain areas of land and not others.

Whenever I have been able to approve of legislation—and sometimes I have found approval difficult—it is on the basis that all Canadians were being treated alike. This was

the principle on which I acted when it came to voting in connection with the old age pension legislation. I do not like the means test. Spell it right in *Hansard*—m-e-a-n test. A means test is always a mean test. If the Government of Canada wants to be generous it can afford to be generous to us all. As far as I am concerned, a millionaire has just as much right to an old age pension as anyone else; he probably worked a lot harder than some of the people who are getting it. In my opinion, a means test is far more unfair and unprofitable than any other piece of legislation on the statute books.

We all want to eliminate poverty as far as possible. In the partisan press we have—and maybe there could be no other kind—writers accusing our leader, the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stanfield), of supporting the idea of a guaranteed income. Well, the only guaranteed income I would vote for—and I speak for myself in this regard—is a guaranteed income in return for guaranteed work. I have never been in favour of a guaranteed income in return for no effort, and I would certainly not favour a guaranteed income for those who spend a great deal more time trying to avoid their civic duty than in trying to do something constructive for themselves or their fellow men. To pay a man a just wage for a good day's work is fair, and will always be fair.

I was disappointed to hear some people trying to say that the trade unions are responsible for most of the trouble in Canada today. That is nonsense. If it were not for the unions a great many people would still be in a condition amounting to near slavery. It is the abuse of union power which has been bad and it is our job here in parliament to see that abuses do not go unchallenged, whether committed by management or by the trade unions. It would be a very good thing in my opinion if management were sometimes to act to prevent a strike by introducing reforms which they know to be long overdue. It would be most refreshing, for example, if management were, some day, to call the staff in and say: Well, we have made a handsome profit this year; we have made a profit of \$54 million; how much of that do you think is due to you as employees as a reward for your work and as a means of ensuring against strikes for the next few years?

An hon. Member: Fifty-five million.

Mr. Bigg: This kind of thing is done in England, in firms such as Rowntrees and Frys whose very names are household words and