

Mr. ROBINSON: Let me come back to a point you made. I would be very reluctant to see Bill C-5 enacted as an experiment, to find out whether it is going to work or not, because I think there are things there that could work the wrong way. I feel we can find a solution to this problem in some mutually satisfactory manner.

Mr. THOMAS: Mr. Chairman, would the witness agree, then, that in considering Bill C-5 we have to weigh any possible advantages against any possible disadvantages and come to a conclusion.

Mr. ROBINSON: Somebody has to do so, yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Cameron.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands*): Mr. Robinson, I would like to come back again to the question Mr. Thomas asked you just now with reference to your suggestion on page 2 of your brief about the establishment of a pool for the rescue of growers who have been damaged by the bankruptcies of processors. In your opinion, would the members of your organization be prepared to contribute a levy to the establishment of such a pool.

Mr. ROBINSON: I had not been thinking of it from the standpoint of a levy from the members of our association; I was thinking of it from the standpoint of the growers themselves doing something to spread any loss. You are just asking 50,000 growers to pick up the chips from 1,000 processors. I am not saying the processors will not sit down and talk over some ideas with you. I am not saying they will not; I do not know. We have not had an opportunity to go into these things as deeply as I would like.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands*): Then can you answer this question? You and your organization came to oppose Bill C-5. We, of course, apologize to you for the inconvenience you were put to through not being able to come on the day it was first suggested. However, you were able to overlook that inconvenience, and the fact that you have done so and that you have come today suggests to me you were anxious to come here and oppose this bill. Would you and your organization come with equal alacrity to oppose legislation to enforce a pool to which processors and growers would contribute?

Mr. ROBINSON: I think I would have been better to stay at home! As a matter of fact, I live in Ottawa so it did not inconvenience me at all. I do not know how to answer your question.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands*): In your opinion, Mr. Robinson, is it fair to ask the growers to assume full responsibility for rescuing their members from the bad judgment or the bad faith of processors without having the general body of processors contributing to a protective fund.

Mr. ROBINSON: If you were buying group automobile insurance or group life insurance would you expect the automobile manufacturer to participate? Would you expect anyone to participate in the plan other than those who set up the plan in order to protect themselves! Would you think that the automobile manufacturer would do this? I believe there are little groups all around the country who get together and say "We'll just have our own little insurance policy among ourselves." I think this is quite a common procedure. Surely you do not expect the man from whom you buy the car or the man who manufactures the car to chip in on this deal.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands*): No, but in that case we expect and receive also the support of the public authorities through legislation which prevents the purchasers of cars from being victimized by producers of the cars. I am suggesting perhaps the same principle should be introduced with regard to producers vis-a-vis the processors. Policing in