

Honourable senators, that is all that is contained in the bill, except for a few minor amendments which are necessary in order to bring the act into harmony. The Unemployment Insurance Fund is as solid as a rock. I commend this bill to honourable senators as good, progressive legislation which is worthy of their support.

**Hon. R. B. Horner:** Do I understand that under one of these amendments a fisherman will have to work for 24 weeks in order to qualify?

**Hon. Mr. Croll:** No. Fishermen are not at this moment covered. They will not be covered until the bill becomes law.

**Hon. Mr. Horner:** It would be difficult to bring the fishermen of western Canada into such an act. We have some lakes out there that are fished on a quota basis. The fishermen are allowed to catch only so many pounds of fish, and when the season closes many of the lakes are completely closed to fishing. I know that in one lake the quota was 250,000 pounds, and before the officials were able to get around and weigh the fish, the fishermen had already caught their quota. In many of the lakes the fishing season does not last sufficiently long to permit the fishermen to qualify under any form of unemployment insurance.

**Hon. Mr. Connolly (Halifax North):** I didn't know they had that many fish in western Canada.

**Hon. Mr. Horner:** Oh, yes, but there is a quota restriction. Restrictions are imposed to protect game fish at summer resorts, and so on. If fishing was permitted to continue beyond certain seasons, it might result in wiping out such fish as the jack, pickerel and whitefish. Incidentally, for the most part whitefish are caught with nets. It is only in rare instances they will go after a fly, but they are a fine fish and are shipped in large quantities to New York and other centres.

To amend the act is all very well. The unemployment insurance plan is being abused, and no doubt with the extension that is being suggested in this bill it will be further abused. Pretty soon farmers will want to come under the act. They find it difficult to get help because of unemployment insurance regulations. Many people would rather get work where they can collect unemployment insurance stamps, which will enable them to draw unemployment insurance benefits in the winter months. A farmer may say: "I am kind of foolish. Look at that fellow. He just works during the summer and he takes it easy all winter, but I have to work the year round, taking care of the livestock and everything

else on the farm. I am going to get a job where I can draw unemployment insurance benefits."

So unemployment insurance is not working out as gloriously in our national interests as we might be led to believe. I certainly have my doubts that it is wise to extend the benefits to fishermen, for they are men who otherwise would find other employment in their off-season. Nowadays when the fishing season is over they are willing to take other employment, but if they come under the act and the fishing season lasts long enough for them to accumulate unemployment insurance stamps, they will say, "We will take it easy in the winter and draw unemployment insurance benefits". Possibly that is not good for the men who try it, and certainly it is not good for the economy of the country.

**Hon. John J. Kinley:** Honourable senators, I do not want to let the occasion pass without saying a word on this bill, for I regard it as a step forward in the fishing industry.

**Some hon. Senators:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Mr. Kinley:** It was refreshing to hear the honourable member from Toronto-Spadina (Hon. Mr. Croll) speak in the interests of the fisheries. My honourable friend said he had fished for votes, and in congratulating him I want to say that he always came in with a full fare.

The senator to my right (Hon. Mr. Horner) said he doubted if the fisheries should come under the Unemployment Insurance Act. Well, years ago I was interested in compensation for fishermen, and I met with a great deal of opposition from those who said that fishermen work on shares and not for wages and therefore are not employees. Then I was told that there would be difficulty with regard to adjusting the details of administration. I said I thought we could overcome that difficulty, and got it arranged that a contract could be made on the shore which would be maintained at sea, and then the fishermen came under the Workmen's Compensation Act. Since that time, of course, social legislation has made great progress.

I always felt it was unfortunate that our fishermen could not share with the rest of the working population of Canada the benefits of unemployment insurance. We at least got to the point where the merchant marine could derive benefits from it. When I tried to bring the matter forward I was told that it was difficult to arrange the details of administration. However, I contended then as I do now that the man who works at sea should be entitled to the same provisions as the man who works on shore. The fisherman is not a partner, but he is a sharer in the sense that he shares in the work of the