

Mr. MURCHISON: That last sentence is in connection with fish processing plants. People who work in a fish processing plant are insured under the ordinary regular scheme, and the processor is really the employer, within the meaning of the act. He also becomes an employer, under a different category, in respect to the fish he buys from the fishermen. Therefore, he has to have two sets of stamps and affix them properly.

Mr. BARNETT: I think it would be well to have that perfectly clear on the record.

Mr. MCGREGOR: I think you are also thinking of tender men on collection boats, who are at present insured.

Mr. BARNETT: On page 10 of the statement, in the section dealing with the special arrangements where cured fish are sold, the second paragraph from the bottom says: "In recording the contributions arrived at in this way, the buyer will stamp for all the calendar weeks back to 1st May—". I am wondering why that date, the 1st of May, was selected, rather than the 15th of April, when the seasonal benefit period expires?

Mr. MCGREGOR: Our information is that there are no fish that can be cured before the 1st of May, because of weather conditions. That is the information we got.

Mr. BARNETT: That date is set because of the actual conditions of the fishing, as is outlined here?

Mr. MCGREGOR: That is correct.

Mr. LUSBY: Mr. Chairman, in my constituency the only important fishing is confined to lobsters, and of course, the fishermen have only the one season, which is approximately two months. It is my understanding, and I just want you to check this, that since he cannot work long enough to get the required number of contributions, his fishing contributions cannot ever be of any use to him, unless he is in some other insurable industry at another time.

Mr. MCGREGOR: That is right.

Mr. LUSBY: And if he is not in any other insurable industry, and particularly if he is farming, as many of them are, he cannot benefit under the scheme?

Mr. MCGREGOR: What does he do the rest of the year?

Mr. LUSBY: As I say, a good many of them farm, and that is not insurable. I was just wondering about their positions. They can never get any benefits from this scheme. I presume the sensible thing for them to do would be to keep out of it altogether, in that case?

Mr. MCGREGOR: If he employs a helper to help him fix his lobster pots, he must insure him.

Mr. LUSBY: Oh, yes.

Mr. ROBICHAUD: Mr. Chairman, I am not a member of the committee but, with the permission of the committee, could I ask a question?

The CHAIRMAN: Is that agreeable?

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Agreed.

Mr. ROBICHAUD: I know in my constituency there would be 1400 fishermen who would register under this scheme; 800 part time and 600 full time fishermen. In an area such as Shippigan-Miscou Islands, there would not be 300 to 900 fishermen involved. I noticed, the last time I was down in my community, that they were advertising, through the radio and the press, asking for fishermen to go to the nearest office to register. The nearest unemployment office is about 100 miles away. Would it be possible, in cases like that, where