

Mr. VINCENT: Yes.

Mr. LIMOGES: I was not expecting a question of this type, therefore I do not know what the firms would say about it. I can tell you that most of the contracts include a clause to the effect that if any grower needs an advance it is given to him.

Mr. VINCENT: Yes, for advance money, but I am talking of bankruptcy.

Mr. LIMOGES: I would have to ask our members.

Mr. VINCENT: This type of clause has solved the problem of British Columbia now, a problem which has arisen here and has resulted in this bill.

Mr. LIMOGES: I will discuss this with our members.

Mr. VINCENT: I have another question. You spoke in the brief about the insurance plan. Would it be possible for all the food processors' associations, the Canadian, Ontario, western and Quebec associations, to group together as for example the packers grouped together? For hogs they were charging one-half of one per cent on the price of hogs so that if one hog or two hogs were dead in the yard or the market they were able to give to the farmer the total amount of money which the hog would have brought on the market. They have created a fund of many millions of dollars for this purpose. When the fund is big enough to reimburse all the farmers who have to support an accident like that, they stop collecting this half of one per cent; and when the fund is low they start it again. Therefore, one year they may not collect any money and another year they may start collecting again. They keep enough money to provide for all these losses. This is not exactly the same subject as bankruptcy, but it is one thing that was done in this business and all the farmers have profited from it. Would it be possible to create some kind of organization of all these companies which would provide a fund especially for bankruptcies in order to protect the primary producers? What do you think of that, Mr. Robinson?

Mr. ROBINSON: I would only be able to answer it in this way. We would have to put the problem to the associations and the associations would put it to their members to see what could be done. I am sure neither Mr. Limoges, or I, whatever our personal feelings might be, would be able to say "yes, this is the answer." I think there are many areas that can be examined, and this is one of them.

Mr. VINCENT: Mr. Chairman, as I said a few minutes ago, we have to do something right now to help the primary producer, and if we do not have anything else in front of us, then we will have to support the bill in its present wording. Something has to be done, and now is the time for legislation on it.

Mr. PASCOE: Mr. Chairman, I had some questions with regard to page 2 about the possibility of insurance or a levy, but I think most of the questions have been answered. Perhaps I could just follow it up to a certain extent.

As other witnesses have said, we are all very much in favour of the principle of more protection for the producer, and I was quite impressed with Mr. Robinson's statement that he thought it was possible to find a solution to the problem in a mutually satisfactory manner. I believe those were his words. I just wonder if he could explain what contract there could be between the processors and producers. What sort of direct contract could be worked out?

Mr. ROBINSON: It would be most difficult to try to have individual growers sit down with individual processors. I think this is something which must be done through growers' bodies, such as the marketing boards or the council, and our provincial associations and the national association. I think this is where this would have to be done.

Mr. PASCOE: But there is a direct contact somewhere?