

There were members who said tonight: we have other means of pressure, we have other solutions within our reach to force the government to act. We of the opposition have been blamed for wanting to make speeches and have been told that such speeches would not move grain. If our speeches did not move grain, they have made it possible for some members from the province of Quebec to express their views on as important a problem as the one we are faced with today. They have enabled some Liberal members who did not have the opportunity before—I do not say they did not avail themselves of it, but they did not have it before—to speak openly in the House, and enabled us to see what they think of the problem.

Mr. Speaker, there is no need to say this is an important problem, since several members have stressed it. The strike that is now going on in the ports of Trois-Rivières, Montreal and Quebec is jeopardizing food supply in Quebec for several months to come.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to take either the millers' or the employers' side, I do not want to take one side, but I would like to refer you to some court judgments. I admit as everybody does that the strike between employers and employees is legal. However, if I refer to a judgment in a trial of Dusessoy and Hersees, in a case of retail clerks union put before Mr. Justice Aylesworth, mentioned in Carrothers at page 462, and I quote:

An hon. Member: What page?

Mr. Rondeau: Page 462 and you can refer to it.

An hon. Member: And what date?

Mr. Rondeau: In 1963, you will see that this is a very interesting judgment which has a direct relation to the present conflict and I quote:

... the secondary strike pickets (that is those who prevent the entrance of the employer's suppliers or customers) were declared illegal because they violate the right of trade. These cases present some remarkable aspects, not only because of the prohibition of secondary action, but also because the decisions were taken while considering the conflicting interests. The proposal was as follows:

"The right... of the respondent to take part in picket lines in a secondary strike... must give way..."

So the members of this House should be serious and refer to that judgment.

... must give way to the right of the petitioner to trade; the first right... is exercised for the benefit of a particular category, while the second is a much more fundamental and important right... as it is exercised for the benefit and in the interest of the community as a whole. For the purpose of the act... the interests of the community as a whole must outweigh those of the individual or of a particular group of individuals".

Mr. Speaker, unlike those who talk nonsense on the other side, those judgments still have their full value, particularly in the current conflict. We recognize the right of longshoremen to strike, but on the other hand, we oppose picket lines which hinder trade or deny the right to supply millers. Those judgments should allow the Minister of Agriculture to take more urgent measures, more effective means to meet the situation.

Mr. Speaker, Quebec producers now have problems, consumers will have some too. Moreover, farm animals have also theirs, not because of animals but because of the

Feed Grain

stupidity of men who have been looking for solutions since 1962, but offer nothing except wishful thinking.

Mr. Speaker, if government members reproach us for speaking too much, we are really anxious to see concrete action not expedient, temporary measures, but positive measures which will solve the problem of feed grains in eastern Canada and will do so for good.

Mr. Speaker, the problem in this House is, in fact, similar to the difficulties in the Babel Tower. In a country as affluent as ours, in a country where grain is abundant, there is a transportation problem between the East and the West. I support the action of the member for Bellechasse (Mr. Lambert) in this House. If Liberal members have, as they alleged, efficient leverage and better means than speeches and words, well, now is the time to prove it.

It is easy to blame the opposition, but only the government party can act. Government members are the ones who can take measures. Tomorrow, when Canadian consumption will be jeopardized, when hundreds and thousands of farmers will be on the brink of bankruptcy because a situation has been allowed to deteriorate, it might be too late. I believe that in such situations supply is involved and we should be able to agree that supply is vitally important for a province. Our Quebec farmers will soon lose millions of dollars.

I would not want the Minister of Agriculture to put forward, by way of a solution, the same ones I have seen since 1962. Anytime there were losses, the Minister of Agriculture offered long term loans to compensate for the losses suffered. The Minister of Agriculture should not suggest as a solution to delay the interests on losses brought about by a situation which the government could have settled otherwise.

● (0240)

When we see such absurd solutions as the ones we have known up to now, some so-called proposals or solutions suggested by the ministers, we are aware that farmers and producers are always a little poorer, always more in debt and that financiers are always a little richer.

An hon. Member: Shame!

Mr. Rondeau: It is pitiful to note that in our economy on a whole for the past two years, the various groups of producers have been in a bad way. Only the banks and their branches as well as monopolies which belong to banks have prospered. The finance companies and banks have prospered. The financiers have thrived, but farmers as other social classes have been in a bad way. All we can offer them is debts, all we can offer them is deferred interests.

Mr. Speaker, since 1962, in every budget speech in, every throne speech, I heard about saving measures to help farmers, but those saving measures, before being tabled in this House, always amounted to the same thing: a bigger farm loan than before, more debts than before and then, we hear government members boasting of having saved agriculture.

Well, Mr. Speaker, when one sees the farmers' situation, when one sees that the number of farmers is decreasing every day in Canada, that debts on farm loans, farm