

*Unemployment Insurance Act*

be wise to take what was described as a backward step in this connection. Consequently, they would like this matter to stand. That is the way I sensed the discussion. I recognize immediately that good arguments were brought forward as to why we should treat firemen in one way and policemen in another, but I shall speak about policemen later. Since my hon. friend has dealt with the firemen, I shall confine myself to them.

It is difficult to persuade groups in some categories to come under the act. The commission has been criticized for not recommending more vigorously that larger groups come under the Unemployment Insurance Act. I feel, Mr. Chairman, that we should not accede to the request that has been made with respect to this group and that paragraph 27 (g) should remain as it is in the bill.

**The Chairman:** Is the committee ready for the question?

Amendment negatived: Yeas 8; nays, 49.

**Mr. Gregg:** May I now say a word with regard to the last part of (g), which deals with the police forces of a province or a municipality? There were expressions of view that on the one hand the policemen of a province or a municipality should be brought under coverage by the action of parliament, which would mean the deletion of these words in the paragraph. There was another point of view expressed that if it is to be done it should be done by regulation approved by the governor in council. Frankly, I would prefer that the commission should explore the possibility of recommending the latter course, if, as a result of their investigation, that is a sound thing to do. It would of course be easier for people to say, well, parliament has said that this must be done, and consequently those who launch complaints could say that parliament can do no wrong. On the other hand, it would be courteous if the commission had an opportunity, before putting it into effect, to consult with the other governments concerned. Consequently, I would hope that paragraph (g) will be permitted to stand as it appears in the bill.

**The Chairman:** Shall the clause carry?

**Mr. Herridge:** Mr. Chairman, on second reading of the bill I made a plea for consideration of the inclusion of agricultural workers and workers in forestry. On reading the minutes of the committee I find that the matter was discussed.

**Mr. Gregg:** May I refer to that, Mr. Chairman? No recommendation was made back to the committee of the whole with regard to

these groups, some of which were referred to by my hon. friend. In the committee I did state that when the commission brought forward its revised regulations after the bill was passed consideration would be given to certain categories of agriculture, some of which are in the same groups that my hon. friend referred to on second reading.

**Mr. Herridge:** I thank the minister for the information and I am glad to know that some consideration is to be given to it. I hold in my hand the report that has been made by the committee that studied this question to the unemployment insurance commission, or to the department, and which I understand was handed to the committee but not included in the minutes.

First of all, I wish to mention that on page 1 of this report it is said that:

Farmers do not as a rule keep extensive records, which would add to the difficulties of inspection and of establishing entitlement to benefit.

I must say I cannot agree with that. Farmers have to keep pretty good records nowadays for the income tax department, and I find that the practice of farmers keeping records is satisfactory to the minister's department, and the records are increasing in numbers.

I should like to quote briefly from the recommendations in this report:

The employments which the commission has recommended for coverage (except when carried on as an incidental part of farming operations) are:

(1) employment in horticulture—

According to the dictionary, employment in horticulture is garden cultivation, *horti*, of a garden; *culture*, cultivation. The recommendation goes on:

—(other than employment in nurseries, greenhouses, vegetable farming and fruit farming).—

I should like the minister to tell me what is left in horticulture when you exclude these, except a bit of titivating with lawns. I think it is a very restrictive definition of the word "horticulture". If that is what is intended, then some other word should be used. Paragraph 2 reads as follows:

(2) those parts of employment in agriculture described hereunder:

(a) employment in the processing of flax;

(b) employment in the breeding and raising of poultry.

In the constituency I represent, many of the farmers breed and raise poultry quite extensively. Some of those who breed and raise poultry extensively may have a small dairy herd. How is the law to apply in such cases? The recommendations go on:

(c) employment in chick hatcheries.

There is in my constituency a very successful general farmer who also has a chick