

The producer organizations asked for a tripartite approach in this legislation whereby they would pay one-third of the premiums, the federal government would pay one-third and the provinces would each pay a third. Consequently, it would be a saving in outlay not only to the producers at a time when farm incomes are going to be down dramatically next year but also a saving to the federal government.

As it stands now the producers pay 50 per cent of the premiums, the federal government pays 50 per cent and it is administered by the provinces. That is why they are referred to as the Canada-Ontario, or Canada-Saskatchewan, or Canada-Alberta crop insurance program.

• (1620 )

It is really enabling legislation that is implemented by the provincial crop insurance commission and, of course, these have to vary somewhat from province to province, depending on the crop being insured and the crop being grown.

The coverage under this bill would improve from 80 per cent to 90 per cent of probable yield for some crops. This is an improvement in this legislation, if it is an improvement. However, I have to point out that if a farmer was insuring for 90 per cent coverage in a field of corn, the premium would go up from \$5.71 per acre up to \$10 per acre. The premiums would almost double for the additional 10 per cent coverage.

In the many years I have been farming, only once have I ever been able to collect on crop insurance, and that was on some new seeding that would have been clover and legumes which smothered under the ice cover. But for those farmers in the drought-prone areas of Canada, particularly the prairies and other areas where we have frost damage and frost risk, it is essential that we have good sound legislation for them.

It is in this context that I and producers across Canada believe that at a time when many farmers are facing financial difficulties it is wrong to have the federal government cut back on its expenditures in this program. Even though it said it will not be spending less, the budget from last April indicated it would save \$2 million over two years.

Consequently we feel that we should re-examine this bill and give the farmers a break in the premiums they pay as well as a saving to the federal government by reducing the premiums from 50 per cent for each of the

farmers and the federal government down to 33.3 per cent.

The farmers across the country want this tripartite sharing and I think it would be a very solid improvement to a program that has served the farmers of Canada very well in the past.

We have tripartite stabilization payments for pork producers and beef, with the producers paying 33 per cent, the provinces paying 33 per cent, and the federal government paying 33 per cent of the cost. Why not the same for crop insurance? The precedent has already been established. I believe that we should be following through in that context.

We are sharing the risk. After all, the producer has no control over weather, nor does the government either at the federal or provincial level, although some would like to claim they do. Because we are dealing with mother nature and the elements I think we should look for a tripartite sharing of the cost.

I should point out that with the higher premiums which will be required, the farmers will take less coverage and there will be a continuing demand for *ad hoc* programs such as the Special Grains Program, or the drought and flood relief programs we have had in the past five years.

Therefore, I would suggest that we should re-examine this bill and I would ask the government to think very seriously about changing that to a straight one-third, one-third, and one-third arrangement.

This legislation has served the producers of Canada very well for a number of years. But it is on a voluntary basis and the all-risk insurance provides, and most of the provinces demand, that all acres in crop be insured. I would have preferred to be able to insure individual farms if that was possible, and I would like the government to look at this as well, because you do not insure all of a person's buildings and then only give a partial payment if only one burns down. You only pay on the individual buildings.

I think we should consider crop insurance in the same way because within a few miles there can be different levels of rainfall or a low lying area that is prone to frost damage in the fall of the year. Therefore, there are areas where there is higher risk than in others. Unlike fire insurance where the insurance is on individual farms or individual buildings, crop insurance covers the whole property. I think that is something we should be looking at in the future to see if that can be accomplished. Again,