

respect to year round fishermen qualifying. I wonder what explanation the commissioner would give to the fishermen in respect to a situation of that kind?

Mr. MCGREGOR: The six contributions in each quarter—let me go back—I think actually when we started out thinking about the year round fishermen what we had in mind was the fellow on wages who works mostly out of the east coast on trawlers; he may work on wages or shares. That was the only person we were thinking of at the time. We thought, however, that perhaps there were other cases that could be covered and the only reason we put in six was to have the man demonstrate that he was a year round fisherman and that therefore there was no quarter in the year in which he did not fish. That is the only difference between the two men. The fisherman has to demonstrate that he has been fishing the year round.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any more questions?

Mr. BARNETT: From the point of view of someone who comes from British Columbia there are some of these recommendations which I personally would very much like to see put into effect, although as I said at the outset of my remarks I realize that the minister and the commission have shown pretty serious consideration for these matters. Nevertheless I am convinced there is no lack of desire on their part to give as complete a coverage to the British Columbia fishermen as they would like to have. I do not see any advantage in pursuing the argument indefinitely at this time, but I think it might be just as well, if the committee should agree, that I read what seems to me to be a summary of the points which the fishermen have made so that they will be available for future study and thought. As I made it clear when I read part of their introduction, generally speaking the fishermen are pleased that the plan is going ahead and they certainly would not want to hinder its coming into effect on the date suggested.

The CHAIRMAN: How long is this summary?

Mr. BARNETT: About half a page.

Mrs. FAIRCLOUGH: Have you got it prepared, or may we take it as read?

Mr. BARNETT: It is listed under three headings. I would not propose to read it except that the minister indicated that he would have had no objection to it being made available. I assumed that this was available to a number of members.

The CHAIRMAN: Well, it is in the hands of the committee, as to whatever the wish of the committee may be. Is it agreeable to have Mr. Barnett read this summary?

Mrs. FAIRCLOUGH: The only thing is this: I have no objection to it in particular, but you would be hearing from one part of the country only with no representation made on behalf of any other part except the west coast. And while it may be very interesting and while it may set forth the point of view of the west coast fisherman, as the minister said, the big difficulty to be encountered is the fact that you would have varying opinions from people in different parts of the country. I cannot see any great point in doing it, but neither have I any great objection provided it is not represented as being representative of fishermen generally all across the country.

Mr. BARNETT: Well, Mr. Chairman, if the committee generally is not agreed, I shall forego reading it.

Hon. Mr. GREGG: I think both Mr. Barnett and Mr. Hahn have brought forward—and quite rightly—representations on behalf of this very important union.