

could perhaps pick out one or two of the salient points and ask questions on them and try to incorporate in them enough of what is contained here to be clear in regard to the points that I am raising.

Hon. Mr. GREGG: Would you prefer to do it before the committee, Mr. Barnett—I am quite sure that my officials who have been through that brief from the beginning to the end, would be glad to talk over any points arising from it, if that will be satisfactory to you.

Mr. HAHN: No, I would not agree with that, Mr. Chairman, because I am sure that some of the points which Mr. Barnett is concerned about are also points which concern myself and in which Mr. Philpott is also interested in respect to the Pacific coast and I think we should all like to be familiar with it.

The CHAIRMAN: Well let us have your questions, Mr. Barnett.

Mr. BARNETT: Mr. Chairman, there is one question which arises indirectly out of this matter, which I know has been very much the concern of the responsible officers of this organization, and that is the fear that because of the change to insurable employment of fishermen who in some instances might have been able to go back to other periods of non-insurable employment and qualify for benefits, in some cases they would be in a worse position, now that they are classified as insurable employment than they were prior to that, where they spent some of their time in employment that was insurable. Now, may we have some assurance as to whether the regulations will take care of the situation.

Mr. MCGREGOR: Well, as a matter of fact Mr. Rigby discussed that point with me and it was in connection with the extension of the qualifying period. He has in mind those people who are engaged in fishing, and perhaps some lumbering, and who were able to go back to a period of fishing to get old lumbering contributions.

Now, as I pointed out to him, fishing is now insurable, and of course it cannot be used for extension purposes. In other words you cannot have it both ways. But I know of no method whereby we can say that this is non-insurable employment for the purpose of extension of the fishing, and not say it for other insured employments.

Frankly, I wrestled with the thing for quite a while and I have no answer to it. I understand roughly there may be some three or four hundred people involved altogether for whom extensions had been made in the past years. But frankly because of the fact that it is now insurable employment I could not see how they could have it both ways and I could not get an answer to it. I have not forgotten it though and it is still in the back of my mind.

Mr. BARNETT: I think we all realize that the fishermen generally of British Columbia will, in the main, be in a position to qualify as insured fishermen, and that it will be to the advantage of most of them not to stay out. Therefore I think it is important that the questions that will arise in the minds of those fishermen should be answered. I have one other question: in relation to the qualifications of a full time fisherman, the union does raise the question as to why it is necessary to introduce the special qualification that a hired fisherman must also have at least six fishing contributions in each consecutive calendar quarter. They give an example of the distribution in various quarters, showing that in one case a fisherman has five, ten and thirteen stamps in four respective quarters, while another one has six, nine, six and six stamps, so that the man who has actually made the smaller number of contributions into the fund is able to qualify while the man with the higher number of contributions is not able to qualify. They point that out as an anomaly under the present plan in