

ing and unstuffing of containers. We talked as though the union were attempting to obtain that right when in reality they had that right. What the strike was about was management's determination to remove that right. You remove the right through collective bargaining by a fair exchange.

The problem in the three Quebec ports, if I may say so, stems from the fact that last year some 1,500 longshoremen were not remunerated to the extent of some \$12,000. They were guaranteed, however, 40 hours' pay weekly if I recall, regardless of whether or not they had to work.

● (2200)

This is a very generous contract like the one signed in New York by Mr. Gleason, but I have no way of knowing whether the contract is viable. It is suggested that this new contract creates a financial burden that will make it impossible to maintain operations, particularly in view of the vagaries of economic conditions around the world. It is very difficult to maintain the volume necessary in order to maintain this type of contract.

Let me say specifically that I believe there are too many units. We must remember the strike of the blue collar workers which caused so much havoc and that this was due to the number of public service departments involved. As far as I am concerned, the unit was spread too far across involving too many departments of the government, increasing the opportunity of the workers to defy the law and injunctions. The injunctions were not for the purpose of disseminating information but, rather, to harass the people who would otherwise have been pleased to cross the picket line, mind their own business and do a day's work. In other words, if everybody obeys the law, then a strike will have minimum effect, not doing too much damage other than to the parties that find their differences too great to reconcile, therefore leading to a strike.

Mr. John A. Fraser (Vancouver South): Mr. Speaker, I should like to begin by paying my compliments and the compliments of my party to the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Lambert) for introducing this motion today. In view of the remarks of the Postmaster General (Mr. Mackasey) in the last few minutes, I think I should invite all hon. members of this House to join me in expressing appreciation to the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. La Salle) in joining the hon. member for Bellechasse in presenting the motion, giving us the opportunity to debate a matter which every member of this House who is sincere about serving the public interest of Canada cannot help being concerned about. I want to say, through you, Mr. Speaker, that there is a great deal of truth in what the Postmaster General has said, and I hope much of what he said will receive approval from both sides of the House.

I think it is important that we remember that the subject which brought on this emergency debate tonight is not used as an attempt to debate the issues between the Maritime Employers' Association and the longshoremen. This motion is not an attempt to debate the question whether longshoremen in ports other than those that have been struck have been obeying the law or carrying out the terms of their contracts. There will be time enough to debate that matter.

Feed Grain

The Postmaster General quite properly alluded to certain things going on which are wrong and about which we all know. The point at issue tonight, I am sure all hon. members agree, arises from the fact that the producers in the province of Quebec have come to members of parliament on all sides of the House stating that they need help. This motion introduced by the Cr ditiste party and by the hon. member for Joliette on behalf of my party did not come out of the blue; it came as a direct request by the producers of the province of Quebec for help. In fairness, they did not come to members on just one side of the House, as the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Ouellet) appeared to suggest. That minister had quite an enjoyable time for a few moments naming the members—and he gave their ridings—who had discussed these problems with representatives of the producers in Quebec. Let it be very clear to everyone in the House that these producers felt it necessary to come to members on this side as well. Just as I am sure members on the government side listened, members over here listened.

The question to be answered in this debate is whether the government has satisfied us that the complaints of those producers are being met by some sort of government action, or whether in fact the complaints are well founded. I listened extremely carefully to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and made notes of his points and the steps he said the government had taken to allay the fears of the people from his province who came to him and to us, and in looking at that list I hope the minister does not expect us to take him seriously.

I am quite sure the gentleman I met this morning in the office of the hon. member for Joliette would not take seriously what the minister said. I am sure that hon. members on the government side, especially those from the province of Quebec—a province that I love dearly and which gave so much to this country—will not believe the minister. I do not suppose it is my place, as a relatively new member of this House, to unduly chastise a member of the cabinet, but I suggest—we are entitled tonight—as are the people who came to us asking that we bring on this debate—to hear a little more from the government side about the factual situation, what has been going on and what is being done about it.

With great respect to the Postmaster General, who touched on a subject that is very important but not the subject of this motion, we did not hear from the two ministers who spoke tonight a single word about the actual situation respecting available feed grain supplies for the farmers of Quebec. It does not matter how you want to slice it, that is the fact. I invite hon. members to examine *Hansard* in French and in English and I suggest they will not find one assurance that there are adequate and available supplies of feed grain for the farmers of la belle province. We have not had a single assurance.

Furthermore, there has not been a single suggestion tonight by any member on the government side—and we have heard from two members of the cabinet—regarding the government's intentions. In fairness, the Postmaster General said, and I agree with him, that no union in this country, no matter how justifiable its grievance, has the right to take the law into its own hands. It should be made very clear at this time, if it has not been made clear before,