

Dissatisfaction with Dairy Policy

provided by the rules of the house do not permit the subject to be brought on early enough and the public interest demands that discussion of the matter take place immediately.

In this regard, if Your Honour were to look at the orders of the day you would find no opportunity provided in the rest of this session to discuss the subject matter contained in the motion of the hon. member for Villeneuve. Some special motion or provision would have to be made by the government before a debate on this matter could take place during the remainder of this session. Therefore I suggest to Your Honour that the condition laid down in paragraph 3 as to urgency of debate is also met.

If we do not discuss this matter under the provisions of standing order 26, Mr. Speaker, there is no other provision that would enable us to discuss the matter during the balance of the present session. In other words, this question would have to be put over until the new session if it were to be discussed at all by this parliament.

Last, but perhaps not least, paragraph 5 provides:

The adjournment of the house cannot be moved with reference to critical conditions generally prevailing in certain parts of the country.

This motion does not refer to critical conditions prevailing in certain parts of the country, Mr. Speaker; the motion refers to critical conditions prevailing in the dairy industry all over the country. Therefore I suggest to Your Honour that the motion of the hon. member also meets the condition laid down in paragraph 5 of citation 100.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I think it would be far more useful to spend today debating this issue and if possible finding some solution to a very serious and critical agricultural problem in this country than to spend the day in repetitious debate on Bill No. C-243, a debate which is going to come to an end in a few days anyway.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, I should like to second the motion of the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette), requesting an urgent debate on the government's dairy policy.

I believe sincerely that there is urgency in the matter. Everybody knows that the government house leader (Mr. McIlraith) has given us notice that a motion will be put to the

house within two days and that the meaningless discussion on Bill No. C-243 will go on for the two next days.

On the other hand, a motion has now been put by the hon. member for Villeneuve, proposing a debate on the dairy policy of this government.

What, Mr. Speaker, and this is an important question which must be decided today, is the most urgent problem we have to discuss at this time? Is it national defence? In view of the motion presented by the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. McIlraith), will a debate on this subject produce a concrete solution today or tomorrow? Obviously, the subject matter of the motion presented by the hon. member for Villeneuve is of greater urgency. The business on the orders of the day is futile and useless, in view of the motion presented by the hon. Minister of Public Works at the beginning of this sitting. On the other hand, a discussion on the subject matter of the motion presented by the hon. member for Villeneuve could produce results beneficial to many Canadians, that is, the farmers and the milk producers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, not only is there urgency in relation to the other business of the house that we will consider this afternoon, but there is also urgency with regard to the impending demonstrations which the farmers are preparing to carry out throughout Canada. And there is also urgency with respect to the disaster entailed by a farmers' strike. We have seen recently the consequences of such demonstrations in the United States where there were many injured and large quantities of milk were dumped in the sewers and in the streets. Well, Mr. Speaker, such a disaster is imminent and the farmers are getting more angry to see that the federal government, with its dairy policy, is forgetting them. It is urgent, Mr. Speaker, to take the necessary steps to avoid such a disaster.

Mr. Speaker, there are some precedents on which we can base ourselves. For example, the railway strike. We had been told that there was no urgency just before the strike broke out and then there were losses of several million dollars each day. Another precedent: the strike in the ports on the west coast. The adjournment of the house had been asked to discuss that matter, but we were again told that there was no urgency. Now, some ten days later, financial losses of about \$1.5 million daily were being incurred. We were told then that this was an emergency and that not an hour, an hour and a half or two hours