

Members to show their intellectual honesty on that issue, and to say: "We are ready to take up constitutional negotiations, we are ready to recognize a special status for Quebec." Let us start by granting Quebec a special status as far as agriculture is concerned, to provide what Quebec farmers need. Our 58 speechless—we had in Quebec a leading pump attendant and we expected him to put oil multinationals in step, but now, Mr. Speaker, we have absolute silence. Among Quebec Members, two have shown courage, the Hon. Member for Hochelaga-Maisonneuve (Mr. Desrosiers) and the Hon. Member for Rouyn-Noranda. But all the others are just cowards.

I think they will have time to think the legislation over during the summer recess. Because as I recall, when I was MLA in Quebec and farmers were not satisfied with the provincial Government's policies of the time, things went rough. Manure flew over the lawns. There were a number of activities, and I remember that Members for those areas stood up after that, but it was too late. Where are those Quebec Members? We see here Mr. Proulx, representing UPA. We crumble under new taxes. In the federal budget, the bill is steep: "UPA opposes the Bill on red meat."

Faced with American threats of tariff barriers, Garon, the Quebec Minister, supported the Hon. Member for Lévis (Mr. Fontaine), a Conservative, during the last elections. He must be rather sorry that the latter should have betrayed him here today. Garon, in Ottawa, failed to defend pork producers in this country. Oh yes, a headline we saw every where: "Mulroney promises to defend pork producers". He made so many promises that guy. But we see no action.

"Red meat stabilization. Quebec farmers press for the Bill's withdrawal". Can you read? Do you understand anything, Members from Quebec? Can you speak? You should stand up a little. Another newspaper report: "Pork returns. UPA calls for general mobilization". The Hon. Member for Richelieu (Mr. Plamondon) never rises to do anything. It is about time he woke up over there. He was here to vote on his knees for Mr. Reagan's party. How many millions did that cost for the Conservative gang, to go there on their knees: "Mr. Reagan, we are going to fix all that?" The next day, Quebec farmers took the loss. The very next day, Canadian producers incurred losses. The balance sheet for hogs is as follows: for the Beauce area, a loss of \$4.5 million. Where is our brave member for Beauce (Mr. Bernier)? Where is he hiding? Has he left for the pigsty? Come on, that is unacceptable.

From the Editor . . . François Côté: Bill C-25 and the US imposed countervailing duties on Canadian hogs. Mr. Speaker, I think everybody should read this. Two major events are occurring now within the agricultural community. Each of them is very complex, but the link between the two is even more complex which makes the whole situation for most people understandably confusing. That is the perfect image of our Prime Minister. On the one hand, there is the Federal Government who has introduced in the House of Commons bill

C-25 and who, while seeking to amend the Agricultural Stabilization Act, is in fact trying to get rid of the provincial price and income stabilizing schemes which exist in Quebec and several other provinces.

Mr. Côté continues: Bill C-25 provides that producers involved in a provincial stabilization scheme could not benefit from the federal one. Which means that because Quebec is helping farm producers, the Federal government will keep away. Once again Quebecers are being stuck in the middle! Again from Mr. Côté's article: The bill provides that producers—that is worth repeating—who benefit from a provincial scheme will be penalized by the Federal scheme. If adopted, this legislation would confirm the government's refusal to pay Quebec producers \$6.54 per hog for 1983-84, in line with its refusal a few years ago to pay sheep producers. I thought the Minister of Public Works had promised a cheque during the election campaign, but there is a problem with his cheque: it is worthless for lack of sufficient funds. Mr. Speaker, it is a shame that such things should happen.

I continue quoting from Mr. Côté's article: The decision to stop the various provinces from implementing top-loading plans does not make any sense at all in view of the fact that nothing prohibits the provinces anxious to help their farmers from subsidizing them indirectly by reducing the difference in costs or from adopting policies aimed at providing farmers with services more cheaply. To pass Bill C-25—and it is important that all Members of this House hear this—would be to systematize hypocrisy and I will say it over again, Mr. Speaker, in case someone failed to understand: To pass Bill C-25 would be to systematize hypocrisy, because from a strictly economic point of view, to increase revenues or reduce costs amounts exactly to the same thing.

I quoted part of an editorial signed by Mr. Côté, a well-known authority on agriculture in Quebec and a highly qualified man.

Mr. Speaker, in the past week of two all the Liberal Members in this House have been trying by every possible means to sensitize the Members of this House, mainly the Quebec Members, and convince them that Bill C-25 should be geared to regional needs at the provincial level. Such a request, Mr. Speaker, would be consistent with the comments made by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) during the election campaign in Quebec and with the same comments repeated when the Quebec Government requested constitutional amendments, as well as the comments he made at his meeting with the Quebec premier this week.

What producers are asking is quite simple. They want the same thing the Prime Minister wants but in fact refuses to give. They want programs that are regionally adapted that acknowledge the specific nature of agriculture in Quebec. They do not want promises, they want action to harmonize federal stabilization programs with the programs the provincial government makes available to farmers, including subsi-