

[Text]

approach of 100 per cent. Under the terms of the program as it is proposed at the present time and as it is being discussed among the provinces and with producer organizations, the producer would contribute one-third, the federal government would contribute two-thirds, the provincial governments would not contribute. The federal government would pay the administrative costs of the program and the level would be 100 per cent of the margin.

I think the interesting thing, Mr. Hargrave, is a method of controlling—everyone is concerned about overproduction. What would be the participation level? What would you cover? Obviously if you covered all the cattle and all the growth, then you could have disaster; you could have far more increase in production than the market can absorb and then you would have a very disastrous situation. However, if there were some method of controlling the eligibility, the portion of the person's crop or production that was eligible for assistance, then if you only covered a 4 per cent growth factor on an annual basis, or attempted to control it in some way, or you only covered a certain percentage of his total production, you could control that oversupply.

But these are all considerations which are still very much being looked at in this initial design stage. It is far from being an accepted program at this point. It is still something which is being discussed. And we realize there is a great deal of concern, particularly on the part of beef producers.

• 2035

The Vice-Chairman: Mr. Hargrave.

Mr. Hargrave: Mr. Chairman, there is another angle here I wanted to mention. It seems to me that some way or other, probably at that first Minister's meeting the Agriculture Ministers were there, presumably, with their staff—that that is perhaps where that 100 per cent figure might have got started. I am only surmising again. But it is rather interesting to speculate on how that 100 per cent got in there, how you started at that level. Now this is speculation too but I think it is rather realistic. The only way that I think you can speculate on why it is in there and why they started at that level is that you people that were planning this had to contend with the various provincial plans. It would appear that maybe you started with the richest one of them all because that was the only one on which you could get agreement from the various provinces, and that one was the B.C. Farm Income Assurance Program. That would be a place of at which you could get some agreement to get started. But, as I have said, that is speculation. I do not think there has been anything come out in print about this, but this concerns me.

Another thing that you have to be concerned about too is the cost. I think the federal government seems to be the host to these kinds of meetings and are putting them together, and somewhere along the line there must have been an indication that the federal treasury was going to bank this whole idea. And it would be a rather substantial amount.

This bothers us because, of course, 1976 is not that far behind us. The last thing that our Canadian cattle industry

[Translation]

garantie de 100 p. 100. Selon le programme proposé à l'heure actuelle et faisant l'objet de discussions avec les provinces et les organismes de producteurs, les producteurs contribueraient pour un tiers, le gouvernement fédéral pour les deux-tiers qui restent et les gouvernements provinciaux ne contribueraient pas. Le gouvernement fédéral payerait les frais d'administration du programme et 100 p. 100 de la marge.

L'aspect intéressant de cette question, monsieur Hargrave, c'est la méthode de contrôle... car tout le monde craint la surproduction. Quel serait le degré de participation? Quelles denrées seraient visées? Naturellement, si le programme englobe tout le bétail et toute la production, on court au désastre; l'accroissement de la production pourrait dépasser largement les possibilités d'absorption du marché, ce qui pourrait mener au désastre. Toutefois, si on peut réglementer l'admissibilité, la part de la récolte ou de la production qui peut être assurée, si on ne garantit qu'un facteur de croissance annuel de 4 p. 100, si on tente de contrôler cette croissance d'une façon ou d'une autre ou encore si on ne garantit qu'une certaine partie de l'ensemble de la production, on peut ainsi freiner la surproduction.

Mais tous ces aspects font encore l'objet de discussions au point où nous en sommes. Le programme est loin d'être adopté. Nous sommes conscients des inquiétudes qu'il soulève, en particulier celles des éleveurs de bétail de boucherie.

Le vice-président: Monsieur Hargrave.

M. Hargrave: Monsieur le président, je voudrais signaler un autre aspect de la question. C'est sans doute lors de la conférence des premiers ministres à laquelle assistaient les ministres de l'Agriculture, accompagnés sans doute de leurs collaborateurs, que ce chiffre de 100 p. 100 a été lancé. Encore une fois, je ne fais que conjecturer, mais il est assez intéressant d'essayer de comprendre comment on en est arrivé à ce chiffre de 100 p. 100. C'est encore une fois de la spéculation, mais assez réaliste, je crois. La seule explication que je vois, c'est que les planificateurs ont dû tenir compte des régimes provinciaux. Vous êtes sans doute parti du plus généreux d'entre eux, car c'est le seul sur lequel toutes les provinces pouvaient tomber d'accord, je veux dire le programme du revenu agricole assuré de la Colombie-Britannique. C'est le programme qui a pu servir de point de départ. Je le répète, il s'agit de pure spéculation. Rien n'a été publié à ce sujet, que je sache, mais cela me préoccupe.

Un autre sujet de préoccupation, c'est le coût. C'est le gouvernement fédéral, je crois, qui est l'hôte et l'organisateur de ces réunions, et il a sans doute été entendu que ce serait le Trésor fédéral qui financerait ce programme ce qui représenterait une somme assez importante.

C'est assez inquiétant, car 1976 n'est pas si loin que cela. S'il y a une chose dont le secteur de l'élevage au Canada n'a