damage compensation program as are appointed by provincial governments.

(3) The function of the advisory committee is to monitor the efficiency and performance of every insurance scheme and waterfowl crop damage compensation program as well as any matter deemed relevant by the advisory committee.

(4) No terms or conditions determined under subsection (1) shall provide for any remuneration to be payable to any of the persons acting on the advisory committee."

He said: Mr. Speaker, Motion No., 10, standing in my name, is designed to put in place a national advisory committee. We were told in the committee hearings that that was not possible to do, that there were drafting difficulties in this. I have been very careful in drafting this motion to not make it compulsory. It says that "the Minister may constitute an advisory committee on any terms and conditions determined by the Minister". It also sets out those terms and conditions.

We believe that there has to be a better system of safety nets. Crop insurance is one way to get better safety nets. When it comes to agriculture, Canada is not one country, it is at least four or five countries because the types of agriculture that we see in southwestern Ontario are very different from those that we see in northern Ontario, in western Canada, in British Columbia, in Quebec and in the Atlantic provinces. We believe that if you had a national advisory committee on crop insurance that it could lend a great deal of support and assistance to those producers across the country.

• (1640)

We have been very careful in drafting this legislation that it does not infringe on the Royal recommendation, that it does not involve remuneration or other matters which might infringe. A national advisory group could sit down with the minister from time to time throughout the year and would be able to say: "Look, crop insurance nationally is not working because the premium costs are too high". This would have to be canvassed by the various members of the advisory group. If you had a tripartite way of funding, where the farmer would be paying the same amount as the federal and provincial governments instead of the 50 per cent that is proposed in this bill now, it may be that we would get much better coverage.

For instance in the drought year, 1988, corn producers' coverage was something like 30 per cent, or perhaps even lower. Yet they were facing a disaster of tremendous proportions throughout those hot, dry days of June and July 1988.

I believe that this amendment would make this available to the minister. It does not require him to do it because that involves infringing on the royal recommendation. It simply provides a formal arrangement for an advisory group that could meet from time to time.

The minister constituted a task force this winter which is looking at safety net mechanisms. This would put in place a safety net mechanism for consultation on an ongoing basis for crop insurance. Clearly, this is an ongoing demand, an ongoing need, where hundreds of millions of dollars at the federal and provincial levels are spent every year.

There has been some criticism that the administration of crop insurance is sometimes too loose, or that the system is not sensitive enough. This would give us a national perspective where the minister would be able to have representatives from all across the country.

We have known since last November that we have had a demand. Groups like the Prairie Pools have been demanding in the strongest possible terms since last November that the minister bring in a special support program, over and above crop insurance. If he had this advisory board, perhaps he would realize how urgent this is.

The fact that the Premier of Saskatchewan wrote to the Prime Minister last November does not seem to have had any effect. The fact that the Premier of Saskatachewan, a week ago Monday night, went on province-wide television calling for a program of hundreds of millions of dollars of cash flow support, does not seem to have had much impact.

Perhaps if the minister would constitute this advisory group he would see how urgent it is that the government make a cash payment like those that are recommended by the Saskatchewan Pool. We are talking in terms of $500 million. They have been making this request for about four months now. It is essential that payment be made in the next few weeks.

Yet, when officials came here a week or two ago to meet with the Department of Agriculture, they said: "We have not made the decision but if we did make the decision it would be about four months until funds