

and everything added to it. It does not matter what the price is. If you have nothing in the bin to sell, it is difficult to make money.

When I asked them in the legislative committee if the changes in this piece of legislation were going to improve the situation, they said that the potential was there to make some improvements. I asked if the producers and the farmers in Saskatchewan could afford this program, and they said no. I spoke to a producer from Saskatchewan last night who advised that in order to go up to the level of coverage that this legislation allows them to go to and which they want, it will increase the premium on their farm from \$11,000 to \$23,000 a year. This producer said that he cannot spend the \$23,000 and he is going to have to take that risk.

The purpose of the Crop Insurance Program is to take some of that risk out. It has to be an equitable program. It has to be an affordable program. It has to give adequate coverage. Some of those criteria have been met.

• (1710)

If there was such a committee put in place, I feel that it would give the minister the opportunity to feel out the sense of what is there and hopefully avoid some of the pitfalls that can occur from time to time, whether intentional or not.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I believe the nays have it.

Government Orders

And more than five members having risen.

Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), the recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

On a point of order, the hon. Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, I am advised that when you called the question on Motion No. 5, I was involved in a bit of an exchange with the hon. member for Broadview—Greenwood, and that there may have been a misinterpretation on the position that was expressed on this side of the House in that we were opposed to this particular motion. I wonder if you would seek the unanimous consent of the House to go back to the consideration of Motion No. 5 so that the question might be more appropriately put.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): There is not unanimous consent.

Mr. Mazankowski: Since opposition members have won that round, because they have refused to give unanimous consent to go back, perhaps we could agree to move on to third reading. I think that that is a very major concession that has been granted and it might help us in facilitating the passage of this bill.

I want to repeat to hon. members the points that have been made across the way on the motion that has been proposed by the hon. member for Algoma. I say again that I have a lot of sympathy and it has a lot of merit. Again, I went out to make doubly sure and our Justice officials have indicated and advised us that there clearly would be jurisdictional problems with the motion that is being proposed as it relates to the relationship between the federal and provincial governments.

I want to make it very clear that the only reason that we on this side of the House are taking that position is strictly on the advice of our Justice officials. I think that we will be able to achieve the ultimate objective and really put into effect what the hon. member is proposing here in a different way. I wanted to make that clearly understood by all hon. members. Perhaps with those kind words, we could proceed to third reading.