

Agriculture and the Prime Minister. We should start as soon as August to tour the constituencies like we did for the old age pensions, to meet the farmers in each town and each village to develop an action plan to force the Minister of Agriculture, and if he does not want to listen, to force the Prime Minister to respect his commitments to provide a special status for Quebecers.

Mr. Tardif: Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I would like to join my colleague for Shefford in paying a special homage to my colleague for Montreal-Sainte-Marie, who, because of his involvement, has succeeded in defending the interests of Quebec farm producers and who has just fought and won an historic battle for all Canadian men and women.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to hear what my colleague for Montreal-Sainte-Marie thinks of the comments made by the Hon. Member for Mégantic-Compton-Stanstead (Mr. Gérin) who, earlier this evening, showed how the Quebec Members had submitted most shockingly when he said in his speech that farm producers agreed with the intentions of the Government to pass Bill C-25.

I would like to ask my colleague for Montreal-Sainte-Marie, whom I understand met with UPA representatives from Nicolet yesterday here in Parliament, what was the reaction of these farm producers and what they asked him to do as a Member for an urban riding.

Mr. Malépart: Mr. Speaker, my colleague asks what I think of the comments made by the Conservative Member whom I do not know by name or by constituency as we hear so little from these people. I am told he is from the Eastern Townships.

It was the same for the old age security pensions. All the Conservative Members learned a single sentence. Like in Russia, they are briefed to say a certain word.

Everybody repeats the same thing, nobody knows what it is all about but it does not make any difference, we have met the people and they agree. However, I must say to my colleague that when I met the APU representatives yesterday, they told me the same thing. They did not say what the Tory Members and the Minister of Agriculture are saying in this House. However, those people completely disagreed and urged us to make a similar request to the Tory Members and bring pressure to bear so that the Bill would not be passed. They want that Bill to be delayed so that the Minister of Agriculture and all Members of this House, especially those from Quebec, may visit their constituencies during the summer recess and sound out the farmers and the people, because I think it is important, as a Member from Montreal, that my colleague from Papineau (Mr. Ouellet), my colleague, the Member for Langelier (Mr. Côté), the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, who represent urban ridings, state their views, since the decision of the Minister of Agriculture will have an impact on the increase in food prices.

Agricultural Stabilization Act

So, I think that all Members of this House should do their utmost to prevent the passage of this Bill so that the Canadian people may be consulted.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): The period for questions and comments has now expired. Resuming debate? Question?

● (2020)

[English]

Mr. George Baker (Gander-Twillingate): Mr. Speaker, my Quebec colleagues have asked me to say a few words on this particular Bill. It certainly does not have the acceptance of producers in the Province of Quebec. In fact, having listened to the debate, I would say that it does not have the acceptance of producers in eastern Canada or in the Maritimes. Now we have discovered that it does not have the acceptance of producers in some western provinces.

I listened to the comments of the Minister when he introduced this Bill, in particular to his remarks regarding statements made by opposition Members, particularly Members from the provinces of Quebec and Ontario. One gets the feeling that perhaps the policy of this new Government, in terms of dealing with Bills which concern primary producers and the stability of their incomes, does not mesh with what the Government said prior to being elected.

Perhaps the most blatant example of this can be found in the statements of government Members concerning provincial agreements. This Government was supposed to be the Government which would answer all disputes with provincial Governments. From now on, everything would be hunky-dory. There would be no objections. The federal Government would become suddenly benevolent and the provincial Governments would say: "Isn't this wonderful; look at our wonderful system".

What has happened along the way as a result of this Bill and other ones? The Province of Saskatchewan and the great Province of Alberta are not very happy with this particular Bill. In fact, the Maritime provinces are saying that they need one of two things, either a substantial subsidy on their feed in the east or some sort of buoying up in the form of top loading on what would be in existence under this Bill.

We have seen provincial Governments accepting the actions of this Government for some time. They accepted them and looked the other way. Along came the cuts in November, and the provincial Governments turned a blind eye and said that things would change. As time went on they saw this Bill, the legislation affecting the fisheries, FIRA legislation, as well as other legislation, and then the Budget. At that point they could no longer accept what the federal Government was offering and saying.

For example, the Province of New Brunswick said no to the fisheries Bill, that was an intrusion into its area of jurisdiction. The provincial Governments are now asking what will be the end result of the Minister's amendment. It leaves things at the discretion of the Minister, and when one looks at the amendment, one understands why there is some concern. I remind the