

The Address—Mr. Rochon

al government has allowed this to happen, because it has done nothing to stop it from happening, I suggest it has some responsibility. I suggest that it should consider a purchasing plan of some sort to cover the immediate surplus problems experienced by the poultry industry, particularly for producers who have lost their traditional markets.

It may be argued that those who have over-produced for a market they did not have, do not deserve any protection. That is a separate matter. But I believe those who have lost their traditional markets have a claim on the federal treasury and the federal government should move quickly to assist them. I know this is an unpleasant matter. I know we have had programs for the purchase of surplus commodities previously. Such a program is not a happy undertaking for a government. It costs money, and there are other complications involved. But, Mr. Speaker, we have a problem. We have it now. Let us do something positive about it now.

We should re-introduce the farm marketing bill, make some amendments to it, and have it passed as quickly as possible so that we may avoid future situations such as this. I think some teeth should be put in the bill so that if provinces do not agree to allow farm produce to move freely within Canada, the federal government could consider sanctions against them, such as the withdrawal of subsidies as was done under the dairy plan. The federal government should also initiate some proceedings before the Supreme Court to clarify the position of the farm marketing legislation and the power of provincial marketing boards.

I wish to make one final point, Mr. Speaker. In the past we sold quite a few eggs abroad. I do not know if we sold turkeys and chickens in any significant amount. I am not even sure that there is a market abroad for these products at the moment, but we hear that there might be a market in Japan for pork, and possibly beef. I wonder if there is not also a market there for chickens and eggs.

I believe the federal government should undertake a more active research marketing program. Since becoming a Member of Parliament I have noted that a great deal of money has been spent on production research, in some cases with remarkable results. But, Mr. Speaker, extensive market research has not been undertaken, and I do not see any immediate plans to undertake it. We have not explored all the avenues available to us. It is high time we did in the interest of Canadian agriculture.

Mr. McKinley: I wonder if the hon. member would permit a question. He mentioned the Conservative party stand on Bill C-197. Could he explain the turnabout in his party's position after they found that the Farmers' Union opposed the bill without major amendment?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

[Translation]

Mr. Jean-L. Rochon (Ahuntsic): Mr. Speaker, I am now experiencing a deep feeling of sadness and with all the Canadian people, I mourn the death of a great patriot,

[Mr. Thomson.]

Pierre Laporte. This feeling of sadness is almost haunting me when I remember the man who had been honouring me with his friendship for several years. Indeed, I cannot forget that he fought at my side in the 1962 election campaign, when I was elected to the House of Commons by the constituents of Laval, and I now realize that there are times in life when words cannot convey all our deepest emotions and we have to remain silent. I will summarize those feelings as follows: Dear Mr. Laporte, may you rest in peace. To your wife, your children, your mother and all your dear ones who mourn you, my most sincere sympathy. They weep, it is true, but they weep for a hero whose name will mark our history in letters of gold.

● (4:00 p.m.)

Those who preceded me, Mr. Speaker, depending on their political affiliation, in turn approved or disapproved the measures advocated in the Speech from the Throne but, upon reflection, one can read between the lines and see the same concern in all members of this House: the greater welfare of the Canadian people.

Opinions may differ on the implementation of certain measures, that is human. But in these tragic times, why not overlook those differences of opinion, why not support one another? Then, each one of us can, in his own heart, be conscious of having accomplished his duty.

I am, Mr. Speaker, one of the eldest in this House. I lived through the days of the depression in the 30s. I lived through the years that followed 1935. I sat in the legislative assembly of Quebec during that time. Then, as today, there was unease and troubles, but perhaps somewhat less than now. Later on, from 1939-1945, that is the second world war, we lived very dark hours indeed.

I read the Speech from the Throne very carefully. In it, I perceived the determination of the government to continue pursuing a policy towards a better and more just society.

I could speak at length on each and everyone of the measures advocated. Others have done so before me. They have analyzed them. The members of the opposition have criticized them and some of the criticism was constructive. The members of the government party have explained the good they can produce, and that is why I shall not go into them again. I merely echo the constructive ideas we have heard.

Last year, when I spoke on the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, I pointed out something which seemed to me very important, that is, air and water pollution. I was then repeating what I had heard in Brussels during the sittings of the NATO science committee. I had been greatly impressed by the following words from a British delegate: "Tomorrow, the bottom of the seas will become the granary of the world." He went on to explain all that can be extracted from the rivers and the ocean, from fish to algae and underground oils. He concluded by saying: "That huge potential is to be protected, and one of the major means is by checking both air and water pollution, and international and national organizations will have to be set up, for in more than one