

it would satisfy the requirement of the Standing Joint Committee.

Mr. Speaker: I have listened very carefully to the hon. minister. I very much regret that my ruling on procedural grounds is causing him difficulty on such a substantive matter. The Minister has asked for consent. I wonder if the hon. member for Mackenzie and the hon. member for Algoma could assist the Chair. The hon. member for Mackenzie.

• (1530)

Mr. Althouse: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. I think the minister has stated the situation quite clearly. The regulations and the practice have included honey. The law as it would have come before this House failed to mention it. I think it was an oversight. I also think we should give unanimous consent to include it, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, and with the permission of the other parties in the House.

Mr. Foster: Mr. Speaker, I think we would like to see honey included. It is an important crop. Although it may not be as large in dollar volumes as some others, I think we would want to see it included.

That way it clarifies that it is covered by the crop insurance legislation, and especially by Bill C-148. Because it is a clarification of what is covered under the term crop, it seems to me that it does not require a change in the royal recommendation. It simply clarifies an existing situation which has been ongoing for a number of years.

Mr. Ferguson: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. We have to give the minister credit for bringing forth this amendment. He obviously is trying to sweeten up this bill. Of course other parts of it were ruled out of order which we thought would have made it much more palatable, but because he has introduced this particular amendment we know what he is trying to do and we will go along with it on behalf of the honey producers of Canada.

Mr. Speaker: I take it there is consent for the minister to move the motion. Again I thank the hon. minister for bringing the matter to the attention of the Chair. Of course I am bound by the rules, but the House can make its own rules and in this case it certainly has done so.

Government Orders

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister, President of the Privy Council and Minister of Agriculture) moved:

Motion No. 1

That Bill C-48 be amended in Clause 2 by striking out line 20 at page 1 and substituting the following therefor:

"criteria contained in the regulations, and includes honey;"

Motion No. 1 agreed to.

Mr. Vic Althouse (Mackenzie) moved:

Motion No. 5

That Bill C-48 be amended in Clause 3 by striking out lines 3 to 8 at page 3 and substituting the following therefor:

"(b) an amount equal to twenty-five per cent of all premiums paid in the province under the insurance scheme in that year."

He said: Mr. Speaker, I have proposed this amendment because I think the words of the act would reflect more clearly the speeches and the public announcements that have been made on this particular area of the cost sharing arrangement. We have been given to understand that the federal government will pay 25 per cent of the premium costs, the provincial governments will pay 25 per cent, and the producers will pay 50 per cent of the total cost of premiums for crop insurance.

This particular amendment would state that quite clearly. In its original form before my amendment it would simply provide for a share of up to a maximum of 25 per cent of all premiums paid in the insurance year by the federal government and by the province, which by simple logic means that the producers would be paying much more than 50 per cent on those particular years. I think this makes the formula clearer and more consistent from year to year. I would hope that all members in the House would support it.

Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma): Mr. Speaker, I should like to rise and congratulate the hon. member on the amendment he has put forward. A similar amendment was proposed in the standing committee. It ensures that the government is not going to welsh on its commitment of 25 per cent.

This bill does some very good things. It provides for greater benefits to be paid under the crop insurance legislation, but the percentage of the premium is the problem. It does not provide for tripartite participation. It does not even provide for 25 per cent participation. It