

Labour Dispute

interest, I believe we are intellectually dishonest as a group in this House.

We have a responsibility to ask the government to call that important meeting, not only with labour unions, but also with businessmen, some of whom border on exploitation. I think that together they can find that sharing formula, that minimum income which is necessary not only to the farmer but the worker as well. And if the government does not move to bring those people together to set up fair standards for everyone I say it is failing in its responsibilities. That is exactly what happened a month ago. With respect to Quebec problems, that is not the first time. A month and a half ago we were discussing an almost identical problem in Vancouver.

So the union has responsibilities vis-à-vis consumers, the people of this country. It is necessary to remind that to the union, just as it is necessary to remind the government which says publicly it has powers that it also has responsibilities. Powers exist to be used. Today they are being used, and it took one month of shouting to get the government to move. We know how much farmers are going to pay for this, and it is impossible to assess the consumer's bill.

We know perfectly well, Madam Speaker, that the public is tired. For the worker what is important is his strike. They condemn the other guy's strike but try to justify theirs. We must try to restore the mechanisms that correspond best to this stability we want, the just society we have been hearing about for a very long time. I think that just society will not build itself. It will be achieved to the extent that we will have at least the courage to bring together the people responsible for the economy, including those in the fields of food and farming, and make them understand that it is time to find a solution, acceptable compromises from which will stem the sharing formula that is absolutely necessary.

Madam Speaker, I will conclude by saying that we support this legislation and we are not attempting to prolong the debate.

I would also like to remind all those who accused me last week of being a member of a political party which does not serve the interests of the province of Quebec, that we proved them wrong last week, in the special debate. Today, however, it is not without a certain degree of hesitation that all my colleagues in this party are assuring the government of their co-operation in dispatching the bill through the House, bearing in mind the urgency of the matter and the interests of the farmers of Quebec and of all of Canada.

Madam Speaker, I hope the government will be doing this again, repeating what he is doing today, saying: We take our responsibilities.

This is not a long-term solution; again, we will see that other similar conflicts will come up and that, if there is no change in all the mechanisms, in all the methods which have become a necessity today, if we do not want to be forced to return to Parliament to pass special bills such as this one—

[Mr. La Salle.]

● (1730)

[English]

Mr. Sharp: Madam Speaker, I believe there is a general disposition to continue the debate beyond six o'clock this evening, and accordingly I have a motion that the hours of sitting be extended beyond that time.

Mr. Jones: On a point of order, Madam Speaker, I do not know of any agreement to extend the hours.

Mr. Sharp: I intend to make a motion under the provisions of Standing Order 6(5). It would, of course, not be our intention to sit after six o'clock in the literal sense—

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Is the motion in writing?

Mr. Sharp: Yes. I move:

That the hours of sitting be extended beyond six o'clock.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): Those opposed to the motion will please rise.

[Translation]

Mr. Fortin: Madam Speaker, on a point of order—

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): Order. I would like to remind the hon. member that he will have a chance to rise on a point of order later.

Mr. Fortin: Madam Speaker, in this case I raise a question of privilege.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): Order. When the House is called upon to vote it is not in order to raise a question of privilege.

[English]

All those opposed to the motion will please rise.

Mr. Baldwin: May I rise on a point of order, first?

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): Order, please. May I put the question? All those who are against the motion will please rise.

Mr. Baldwin: Madam Speaker, if you feel I should not speak I will not do so, but surely we can work out some order from this situation. If the motion is passed as worded we would sit continuously, and from this point of view I urge that there be unanimous consent that I be allowed to say something on this point right now.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): Very well. I will call upon the hon. members for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin), Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) and Moncton (Mr. Jones).

[Translation]

The hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin), the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) and the hon. member for Moncton (Mr. Jones) will speak afterwards.

Mr. Fortin: Madam Speaker, the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp) moved this motion pursuant to a unanimous agreement and saying that there had been consultation. I have to protest, because we were not consulted and therefore we cannot take part in the conclusion