

One of my objects in rising today was to disabuse anybody's mind of the idea that the capacity of that port is limited to anything like 10 million bushels a year. I repeat my belief that 100 million bushels could be shipped out, because the navigation season could very well be extended. Advance information as to weather conditions could be relayed to the insurance agents, so that they would be able to vary their rates according to the weather conditions, ice conditions and so forth. It was not long ago when late in the season there was no more sign of snow and ice at Churchill, or in Hudson Bay than there was in the Ottawa River. The port was open until December and shipping could have been carried on until that time.

In closing, let me say again that the western farmers are disappointed that Britain was not included in the International Wheat Agreement. But they are in favour of the idea of stabilization, and, as the honourable senator who introduced the resolution said, because of the agreement they have a better chance of securing information on conditions throughout the wheat growing countries of the world.

Hon. Mr. Hackett: Will the honourable senator from Edmonton (Hon. Mr. MacKinnon) permit me one more question? If Britain had signed the agreement would she have been precluded from purchasing wheat at less than \$1.50 per bushel?

Hon. Mr. MacKinnon: If Great Britain had signed the agreement she would have been protected by the ceiling price and the grain growers would have been protected by the floor price. Great Britain would not have had to buy more than the amount committed for; but as she is now buying, and a change might occur in the market, it is quite possible that she might be paying in excess of the ceiling price here, because we sell to the British miller and the British miller buys our high grade Canadian wheat to mix with inferior wheat for bread-making purposes, and there is a continuing market for Canadian wheat there.

Hon. Mr. Hackett: But if I understand the honourable senator correctly she could not buy wheat for less than \$1.50 per bushel?

Hon. Mr. MacKinnon: That is right. But a great deal depends on conditions. It is just possible that some serious situation might arise that would affect the price of wheat, but that is not expected, and there is nothing on the horizon whereby this agreement would be affected as regards the floor price and the ceiling price.

The motion for approval of the resolution was agreed to.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE BILL

SECOND READING

Hon. David A. Croll moved the second reading of Bill 449, an Act to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act.

He said: Honourable senators, this bill amends the present act in two respects, both of which are rather important. Honourable senators will be glad to know that it received unanimous support in the House of Commons. It was praised in all quarters, and for a very good reason: it makes a significant and important change and is a long forward step to something which I think all of us wish will come about in due course. It brings under the act all people engaged in fishing: fishermen on both coasts, and those engaged in commercial fishing in fresh waters.

I think it is appropriate that I should give the house a few facts by way of background. A year ago the Unemployment Insurance Act was thoroughly looked into in the House of Commons. I have before me a report which appeared in the *Ottawa Citizen* of June 1, 1955, which reads as follows:

The Government held out hope last night that some of Canada's 66,000 fishermen may be provided coverage under the Unemployment Insurance Act.

Labour Minister Gregg told the Commons Industrial Relations Committee that he and his officials will try to find out how many fishermen might be brought under the act and that this number would be provided coverage as soon as possible.

He said he wants to look at the matter further before making any recommendation to the cabinet.

Mr. Gregg's remarks followed a motion by Dave Croll (L—Toronto-Spadina) that the Unemployment Insurance Act now being studied by the committee, be amended to provide insurance coverage for the some 6,000 fishermen who are paid a regular wage.

The motion was not put to the committee and the matter was left for further study.

STRONGLY PROTEST EXCLUSIONS

At the afternoon sitting, the committee was almost unanimous in protesting exclusion of fishermen from coverage under the act.

That explains my association with the fishermen. I assure honourable senators that in so far as I have been able to find out there are no fishermen in Toronto-Spadina, although one of my honourable colleagues points out that we used to fish for votes there very successfully.

This insurance is a matter of welfare and a matter of right. At the time the subject was under discussion in the other place the minister gave an undertaking that he would look into it, and it is gratifying to know that he was as good as his word. He studied the subject, as did the Unemployment Insurance Commission, and the Government was willing