

this way would enable you to call on the policemen to act if they are not prepared to act themselves.

Mr. ROBINSON: We do not want to see growers victimized; this is something no processor wants to see.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands*): I notice you once or twice suggested that there was an area for negotiation in this field. Would you not agree that there is perhaps an area for legislation in this field too? Quite obviously the negotiations have not been successful or we would not have this bill before us.

Mr. ROBINSON: I would think legislation might be the outcome of negotiations between industries. It might not be in the form of the present bill. I am sure, gentlemen, that we are both searching for the same thing. You want to see the grower protected; we do not want to see him harmed. Surely there is common ground on which we can get together without upsetting all the credit structure of the country.

Mr. VINCENT: I wanted to ask some questions in French, but I will proceed in English.

As I said at the beginning, the principle of this bill is accepted by everyone. There is a problem, however, and we should find a solution to protect primary producers. This brings me to my first question.

Mr. ROBINSON, are you aware of the fact that all farmers' associations in Canada are supporting the principle of the bill and, furthermore, that they are supporting the bill in its present form? Are you aware of the fact that they want this bill adopted in this present session? Are you aware of this?

Mr. ROBINSON: This would not surprise me.

Mr. VINCENT: You agree with the principle, and you would like to have something done about this problem by the government or by negotiation?

Mr. ROBINSON: What do you mean saying that I agree with the principle?

Mr. VINCENT: You agree that there are problems?

Mr. ROBINSON: We recognize the problems, yes.

Mr. VINCENT: And you would like to see something done about it by legislation or negotiation?

Mr. ROBINSON: Preferably by negotiation.

Mr. VINCENT: As long as we cannot find some other way of protecting the primary producer I will support this bill, and I think the majority of the members of the committee will support it. However, if something else can be suggested, we should have it right away. For example I was reading in the brief that in British Columbia there is a clause in the contracts of the primary producer with the processor which provides the grower with security for an unpaid balance after September 15; and this clause was brought into effect after a processor had gone into bankruptcy.

Mr. ROBINSON: Yes.

Mr. VINCENT: I would like to ask some questions of Mr. Limoges. Would it be possible in the relations between farmers and processors and the companies for the contracts to include a clause which will give a privilege to the primary producer to have security on his product after a certain date? Is it possible to include such a clause in each contract for produce which is not paid before a certain date?

Mr. LIMOGES: May I ask you a question on this? There are two kinds of contracts, one which is between the marketing board and the association and the other between a firm and a grower. Are you talking about contracts between firms and growers?