

agree with him wholeheartedly on that. But the whole system is under review by the public for a variety of reasons. One of those reasons is the tendency of labour, and sometimes of employers, to ignore the law of the land and to take the law into their own hands to settle disputes which could be settled by means of the channels provided in every collective agreement in the country.

The hon. member referred to the Post Office. I do not intend to use this debate to talk about the Post Office, though I may say I am certainly not as pessimistic as is the hon. member for Timiskaming, and as a number of other members appear to be. Indeed, I am optimistic we shall get an agreement in the Post Office without a strike, because I believe that 99 per cent of the people who work in the Post Office are decent, law-abiding Canadians who simply want to work in dignity and peace, and who fully intend to do so. It is my responsibility as Postmaster General to see whether we cannot clean out of the Post Office those bully boys who tend to dominate the 99 per cent. It is my responsibility to help do this, and that is exactly what I am doing.

As to the question of feed grain, the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. La Salle) made a point, as did the minister. It was good, honest debate on the question of whether there is sufficient feed grain in the elevators or not. If there is not, then certainly there should be. But the more fundamental question is this: if the feed grain is in those elevators, what is preventing merchants from going there to obtain their feed grain if they wish to do so? The fact is that they are being prevented in some instances by people who believe that the way to settle disputes is through violence.

Picket lines are a legitimate expression of freedom, an informational device which should never be banned under the laws of this land as some people advocate. At the same time picket lines should not be used as a means of bullying decent citizens who wish to exercise their rights and follow their normal activities. It would not matter whether all the elevators in eastern Canada were chock full of grain if the Province of Quebec, where the injunction has been served, does not have the courage to instruct its police forces to provide the necessary protection for the people who want to go into these elevators and acquire the grain.

It is ridiculous, listening to the radio, to hear the Quebec deputy minister of agriculture seeking to shift responsibility to the federal government when it is a provincial responsibility to protect people after a court has decided, on hearing the evidence, that an injunction should be granted.

I shall not get into the argument about the three ports where these strikes are occurring other than to say that the longshoremen are on strike legally. I would be the last to deny them that right. In this area I share the sentiments of the hon. member for Timiskaming. After all, I can remember as far back as 1965, which is not such a long time ago, when the men had to drink out of what amounted to garbage cans; when there were no facilities for them to wash their hands on the waterfront, when people were hired on a daily basis, and when they had to bribe officials in order to get a job. That is all gone and, if it is all gone, it

Feed Grain

is because employers, as well as employees, have recognized the need for change.

We now have an enlightened management in the ports at Montreal, Trois-Rivières and Quebec—a very enlightened management there. This does not mean employers are right in this case, nor does it mean they are wrong. All I know is that the best brain as far as port problems are concerned, Alan Gold—he is not a mediator, as the hon. member told us; he is a conciliation commissioner—was named by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Munro) to endeavour, on the basis of his experience, to come up with what he believes to be the best solution to the problems of the port, in the interests of both workers and employers. I do not intend to pass judgment as to whether his solution, guaranteeing 1,600 hours to workers, \$13,000 a year to work in Montreal, is sufficient. That is not a judgment for me to make. It is up to the workers themselves whether they feel they should accept or reject a guaranteed annual income of \$13,000. I simply think a lot of people wish they had that guarantee.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mackasey: I do not disagree that they have the right to reject it if they feel that to do so is in their own best interest—after a strike lasting two, three, four or five months they may conceivably end up with a better settlement, possibly \$500 more. That is up to them.

The point which has tempted me to participate in this debate has nothing to do with that particular aspect. It is interference by forces outside this country, namely, one Mr. Gleason, President of the International Longshoremen's Association, from the City of New York, who, from his headquarters there, has decided to dictate to the longshoremen of this country what is in their best interests. I say to Mr. Gleason: Stay home and mind your own business.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mackasey: Let the Canadian labour movement solve its own problems. If Mr. Gleason had his way he would lock up the Port of Toronto despite the fact that there is no right to lock it up. The ports of Trois-Rivières, Quebec and Montreal are on strike legitimately. The same Mr. Gleason is interfering with the ports of Saint John and Halifax, and if he has his way he will lock up all these ports in order to divert work to New York where, incidentally, he accepts the same contract as he is recommending the longshoremen of Montreal to reject.

● (2150)

Sometimes you have to do hard things to help your friends. I have not been happy in the last two weeks taking what has been described as a hard line in the Post Office. But what has it been? It is simply that you respect the law, that you respect a collective agreement, that you respect your own signature; that if you have an honest difference of opinion on the work site—and that happens daily—you take advantage of the grievance procedure and obtain justice in that way. If in the public service the grievance procedure is too slow, and it is, then we as a government and as a parliament have a responsibility to see that justice is done by speeding up the grievance