will be allowed to qualify for regular benefit if they can do so on their non-fishing contributions. This will apply only for qualification. For rate and duration, when a fisherman has so qualified, all his contributions will be taken into account.

The other exception applies to fishermen who are not seasonal workers but carry on fishing in every calendar quarter of the year. In their case there is no presumption that they will be regularly unemployed and claiming benefit in the winter months as in the case of seasonal fishermen. Therefore, subject to certain restrictions, such year-round fishermen can be allowed to qualify for regular benefit when unemployed, irrespective of the time of year when unemployment occurs. This rule, however, has to be applied only to year-round fishermen (a) who have become involuntarily unemployed, (b) in whose case it can be clearly demonstrated that they have been laid off because of lack of work, and (c) who are not in a position to control their own employment and unemployment as most seasonal fishermen and self-employed fishermen can do.

It is proposed that for this purpose a person shall be considered a year-round fisherman if his contribution record at the time of claim shows at least six fishing contribution weeks in each of four consecutive calendar quarters. These may be any four consecutive quarters out of the last seven complete quarters preceding the date of his claim, to allow for periods when he may have been sick or engaged in insurable employment other than fishing. Such a claimant will be considered for regular benefit if he has become unemployed because of a layoff for lack of work, so that the involuntary nature of his unemployment can be proved.

Mr. Chairman, that is the summation. Our expert, Mr. McGregor, is here and is prepared to answer your questions. I might add that he has held meetings with members of the fisheries council, which is the employers' side, and with organizations representing fishermen. They have also gone into all parts of Canada where fishing operations are carried on, on a commercial basis.

Mr. Johnston (Bow River): Has this plan been pretty well accepted by fishermen?

Mr. Murchison: I think we can say that while there are some people who are a bit doubtful about it, for the most part it can be said that the scheme will be accepted.

Mr. STANTON: Is it as readily acceptable by inland fishermen as by coastal fishermen?

Mr. James McGregor (Director of Unemployment Insurance): In Manitoba most of the fishing is done in the winter, and those interested there maintain that the period of benefit we have is when they will be doing the biggest amount of their fishing. That is quite true and it applies also to the southern shore of Newfoundland. But the idea of confining it to that part of the year is because overall that is the time when fishing operations contract the most.

Mrs. FAIRCLOUGH: Does that mean that the people in Manitoba will be non-insurable?

Mr. McGregor: They will not be insured if they work less than 20 weeks in the year at fishing operations and elect out. But it should be recalled that even there, from January to April, if a man goes fishing and does not make the equivalent of his weekly benefit, plus allowable earnings, we make up the difference. So they are still protected to that extent.

Mr. BRYCE: I did not catch that.

The CHAIRMAN: Well, you and Mr. McGregor both talk the same way, anyhow.

Mr. McGregor: I am sorry!