

in this country, but I thought another part of his speech was the most cynical thing I have heard since coming to this House in 1972. He said that opposition members in this House, and I presume he meant a number of them, had sad faces because this distressing dispute was over.

An hon. Member: That's right.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): I think that is dreadful.

An hon. Member: It is true; look around you.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): I think it is a shameful statement coming from a minister of the Crown whose government is charged with the basic responsibility for bringing some form of industrial peace to this country.

The hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. McKenzie) said that we could set up all the machinery we wanted, have all the good faith we could get and build everything into the system that man could devise, but unless we are prepared in this country to tackle the problem that is causing some of our difficulties, namely, the fear in organized labour, public servants and people on fixed incomes that their incomes will just not keep up with the cost of living, there will never be any real industrial peace in this country.

Members of the government wanted an alternative, something different. They should look inward and ask themselves whether in this year, 1975, they are really tackling the problem of inflation which is eating the heart out of our economy and causing distress to many groups, setting one group of Canadians against another in a "dog eat dog" attitude. That is the problem we have to fight in this country: That is the problem the people of Canada charge this government to solve.

I will not have a sad face if this government solves the problem. I would be a very happy Canadian and a very happy member of parliament to serve in the opposition or otherwise if we had a government that produced a solution to this problem instead of vagueness, consensus and ministers running off in all directions. The Canadian people and this opposition ask more of this government. We charge the government with the responsibility of delivering solutions to our problems. So far, this government has failed to do that—and that is at the heart of our problem. I hope the members of the Liberal Party who have sat through this debate will take that message to their caucus.

An hon. Member: We don't need your advice.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Please do not come to this House again asking the opposition what it would do. The Canadian people are asking this government what it will do. That is the question in the minds of members on all sides of the House. That is the question being asked by the men and women of this country—the homemakers, the people who are beginning employment, the people who want to own homes and the people who want industrial peace. That is the challenge to this government, and I will support—as will my party—any reasonable effort by this government to meet that challenge. Thus far, the government has not shown that it is equal to the job.

Grain Shipments

Mr. MacFarlane: I should just like to bring to the attention of the House that under our rules not more than one matter can be discussed under the same motion, and I think there is a definite objective on the part of hon. members opposite to broaden this debate.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Arnold Malone (Battle River): Mr. Speaker, one of the most perplexing things to try to figure out in this House is how to understand a Liberal government. Their members get up in the House and suggest that members of the opposition complain but never come up with any suggestions. Just now, when the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker) made a number of suggestions, hon. members said they were not interested in hearing them—and I think that describes the attitude of hon. members opposite tonight.

● (0120)

At this hour, 20 minutes after one o'clock in the morning, I think it is interesting to point out that the Liberals said this issue is not in the national interest. I think if we are to be positive and constructive in respect of the government we have to concede that it believes it is not in the national interest. It would seem that the government does believe this because the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) never once showed up for this debate. The President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Chrétien) came for his speech and then left. The minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board (Mr. Lang) did not remain here except for a few minutes. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) was never here once.

Tonight I will document some information to show that this is a very important issue in terms of the national interest. Throughout the debates in recent days we have heard that collective bargaining is a right. I will not deny that is so. However, we also must bear in mind that this society has no such thing as rights in isolation. A right is a concept that is co-related and interwoven with responsibility.

When we look at the broad spectrum of our society we note that many aspects to which we claim rights also have clearly defined responsibilities. First, if we have the right to drive a car we have the responsibility to be licensed and the responsibility to drive on the correct side of the road. We have the right to breathe air; but have the responsibility not to pollute it. But let us look at what the Liberals have been telling us. They speak about the right to strike regardless of whether or not any responsibility is being shown. Let me give an example. In answer to a question by the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Murta) the Prime Minister replied in part:

The answer really lies at which point the public interest becomes overwhelming and should overwhelm the basic democratic right to strike which has been given by parliament to the workers of this nation.

Then on March 18, as recorded at page 4195 of *Hansard*, in answer to a question by the hon. member for Vancouver South, the President of the Treasury Board replied in part as follows: