

If hon. members are in unanimity, as the Minister of Labour has indicated the House could continue the debate which was in process before four o'clock. But the Chair sees little purpose in hon. members expressing varying opinions. If there is unanimity I will put the question now.

Mr. Schumacher: Mr. Speaker, I apologize to members, but I misunderstood the situation and so far as I am concerned I am willing to withdraw my objection.

Mr. Robinson: Mr. Speaker, do I understand that the debate is to be adjourned at 4.30 so that private members' hour may commence at that time?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair wishes to be sure about this. Do hon. members wish the Chair to ask whether then the time of the debate is to be extended until 4.30, at which time the House will proceed to private members' hour? Is there agreement that this be done?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is so ordered.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Jerome: Mr. Speaker, may I announce that on Monday it is our intention to begin the day with the Judges Act, followed by the pilotage measure, then the clean air bill and at eight o'clock take the deferred votes on this bill. Then afterward—

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Afterward would we have third reading on this bill?

Mr. Jerome: We would hope so.

Mr. Blair: Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions, I understand, and I wonder if I could have unanimous consent to revert to motions?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PROCEDURE AND ORGANIZATION

Eighth report of Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization—Mr. Blair.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT, 1971

PROVISIONS RESPECTING INSURABLE EMPLOYMENT, COMMISSION BENEFITS, PREMIUMS, ADMINISTRATION, ETC.

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-229, respecting unemployment insurance in Canada, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Speaker, if we continue to have points of order, and so on, we will soon reach 4.30. My point of order, which I am not making seriously, is in respect of the minister's remarks about my having taken 40 minutes. It may have seemed like 40 minutes to him but I am sure I had not taken up more than 20 minutes. However, I shall not make a deliberate attempt to continue for another 20 minutes.

I had been outlining some of the principles which might be followed in respect of coverage of fishermen as put forward in 1961 by the main fishermen's organization of British Columbia. They pointed out that employment in the fishing industry should be fully integrated with other types of employment. They suggested that so far as contributions are concerned there should be no distinction between contributions in respect of fishing and other employments.

In respect of benefits it is stated that every contributor should be governed by similar qualifications, whether for regular or seasonal benefits, without regard to the industry or industries in which he may have been employed. Secondly, in respect of weeks of employment it is stated that fisherman's earnings, whether payment is received by the trip or by seasonal settlement, should be averaged over all the weeks engaged in fishing, from the time he sets out for the fishing grounds to the time the boat is tied up at the end of his trip or season.

Mr. Speaker, I would comment on that matter but there is all this talk about it being difficult to determine whether or not a fisherman is actually working. I suggest that a large part of this question has been conjured up. Indeed, the time a fisherman is or should be working is determined by regulation made by the Department of Fisheries and Forestry. It would not be at all difficult to develop a formula which would in fact meet the need clearly in respect of when the man who calls himself a fisherman was working so far as the purposes of this act are concerned. The submission goes on to talk about the system of working out the weekly earnings. I am attempting to condense this a little in the hope that the minister may agree to further consider these matters. The brief reads:

In case of high earnings during a good season not only would higher contributions be paid but it would also be equitable for an additional waiting period to be established (by some formula to be based on earnings as shown by contribution record) before a benefit could be paid, in case of unemployment immediately following fishing employment.

This is a perfectly reasonable proposition and I think it is one which could be worked out if there were in fact a determination to do it—but in my submission there never was such a determination at the time the plan was first introduced. The basic concern at that time by members of the government who were able to persuade their colleagues to go along with this type of coverage—I believe I am correct in my analysis—was to provide immediate assistance to those who earned a living as fishermen on the Atlantic coast of Canada. In my view the legislation was rushed through without proper consideration. Then, because of the developments I have tried to outline, the