

Government Orders

Therefore I missed filing a request with you an hour in advance.

I was wondering if there is any mechanism that you are aware that would still permit me to request that the House adjourn to make the case for an emergency debate on this Draconian initiative.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has put the matter to the House. The only way that his application could be accepted would be with complete consent of the House.

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Speaker: I must advise the hon. member there is not consent.

DEMONSTRATION ON PARLIAMENT HILL

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order on a different matter. Yesterday the Acting Speaker indicated that the Speaker would respond to the concerns raised by hon. members by requesting a report by the Sergeant-at-Arms on the whole issue.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if you could indicate to the House and to hon. members, and to the people of Canada, when such report would be forthcoming.

Mr. Speaker: I understand that there was an exchange of views in the House yesterday. I will be discussing the matter with the Acting Speaker, and I will report back to the House as soon as I can.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

CROP INSURANCE ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed from Monday, March 19, consideration of the motion of Mr. Mazankowski that Bill C-48, an act to amend the Crop Insurance Act, be read a third time and passed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I wish to inform the House that because of the ministerial statement, Government Orders will be extended 31 minutes, beginning at one o'clock.

Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Saskatoon—Humboldt): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak to Bill C-48, dealing with crop insurance. Although the bill very specifically deals with crop insurance, it is symbolic of the direction that this government is taking and has taken relative to agriculture in this country.

This bill seems to be part of the government's effort to reduce its costs to agriculture across the country. There seems to be little concern in this bill for the viability of the farm or any indication that this insurance bill will assist farms across Canada to become viable in any way. It is doubtful that this bill will help stop the exodus from the farms and farm communities across the country.

This exodus could represent the disintegration of rural communities in Canada. Half of the farms in Saskatchewan, for instance, have disappeared in the last 20 years. In the last few years, this exodus from the farming community and the communities which support those farms has been increasing.

While this bill may have streamlined the process of crop insurance to some extent, there is no doubt that the government's purpose for the bill is to reduce the cost of crop insurance to the federal government.

Cost reduction seems to be the driving force behind all of the government policies brought before us in this last five years. The overriding theme in the minister's Green Paper, *Growing Together* is how to cut down the government's cost and involvement in agriculture?

The government is attempting to reduce the cost of agriculture to itself in a number of ways. During its previous term of government, the Nielsen report recommended a number of ways to reduce the cost of federal government programs. One way to accomplish this is to reduce the service the federal government has provided in the past. The cost of a program is passed on to the provincial government, the municipality, the farmer, or the consumer. Another way to reduce cost is to pass the service on to some other organization which then proceeds to charge a fee to provide that service and make it an extra cost to the farmer.

This often results in passing responsibility and control of what happens in agriculture from the government to the multinationals or other organizations. The final step is to abandon the whole process, in most cases to the market. The government's rationale is that the farmer or