

**From:** Duecks Poultry Farm  
**Sent:** Saturday, December 7, 2013 8:27 AM  
**To:** Arlene Oslie - Reception  
**Cc:** FIRB AGRI:EX  
**Subject:** Re: AI Insurance.

Hello

This is in response to your request for comments. This is to inform you that though the proposed AI insurance will give disproportionate benefit to the large corporate farms and large processors who control the industry, it does not provide any real benefit to our farm. We at Duecks Poultry (164A) will not participate in any such insurance program and will be prepared to demonstrate, to the public as well as in court, that we are sufficiently self-insured and that participating in the program will hinder, not help us in any recovery of an AI threat. My opinion is that the fat-cats in our industry (who will benefit the most from any such program) are well equipped to insure themselves, if they want it, and that we should continue to have the freedom to self-insure. The price of quota/return ratio clearly shows that the participants who will benefit the most from the proposed mandatory insurance, are largely the ones buying quota at these high prices. This is only one example of how there is no need to force medium and smaller farms to subsidize what I refer to as a "fat-cat" self interest program.

If there is a industry need to address insurance issues, the supply managed boards, while staying clear of producer's business decisions, could encourage stakeholders to have adequate coverage for their own particular situations. What other kind of regulatory programs could follow if this one is made mandatory??? I have farmed many decades and don't need a chicken nanny to tell me what to do if there is a problem on the farm. A far more productive program for the regulators would be to assure that the quality of product is maintained from egg to chick, to processing to plate and everywhere in between. There seems to be very little energy spent by the boards on actual product/production issues. It is easier to waste levy money on meetings and projects that don't directly relate to consumer concerns about food production.

Sincerely,

Hans Dueck