

Mr. GREEN: I think every member from British Columbia.

Mr. REID: It was fought out in the committee.

Mr. GREEN: Before the committee a learned counsel from British Columbia, Mr. W. B. Farris, K.C., appeared as counsel for certain logging interests, that is, for employers in the logging branch of the lumber industry of that province. He naturally did not want to have his clients included in the scheme, and he put up as strong, and may I say as extravagant a case as it would be possible to put up.

Mr. REID: Which we challenged.

Mr. GREEN: But even at that he did say, as found on page 201 of the report of the proceedings, when he was questioned by the hon. member for Shelburne-Yarmouth-Clare:

Q. You are against any extension of the act to include the loggers and are satisfied with it the way it stands?

Here may I point out that Mr. Farris was perfectly willing to have the sawmill and shingle mill men come under the scheme but not the loggers. The answer was:

A. We are satisfied with it. I would, however, go this far; if after investigation it was found that it was practical or desirable to bring the loggers in under the provisions of the act we would not be opposed to it.

The Chairman: That is, if the advisory committee investigated and made such a recommendation?

A. Yes. . . .

All we ask is that the government give power in this paragraph (c) to the unemployment insurance commission to make such an investigation, which would be perfectly satisfactory even to Mr. Farris. If the change we ask is not made, that cannot be done. I appeal to the Minister of Labour to show his great common sense and sense of justice in regard to this question. Our province is vitally concerned about it. I ask that he make the change requested.

Mr. McLARTY: There seems to be some misconception as to the reasons that prompted the committee in not making the amendment to part II covering the exceptions. It is in one part of Canada undoubtedly a definitely seasonal industry; in another part it is not. It is just a question of how far this parliament should go in regional legislation. But it was not by reason of the seasonal nature of the work that it was thought wise to exclude logging. It was largely because of the administrative difficulty involved; the matter of inspection, of attendance at employment offices, of the rapid turn-over of labour. The question was brought up at the subcommittee

meeting, and Mr. Watson, the chief actuary of the department of insurance, in dealing with the matter, stated:

. . . You have to keep in mind the whole scheme of administration, including inspection. . . . The difficulty is to know that the contributions have been properly paid; know they are at work when they claim they are at work, and all these things. You see how easy collusion would be. . . . Take administration for instance. They must have their employment book, and they must register, so that the inspection department may know or be able to check up to see if the stamps are kept on and to see that the persons are at work. . . . There is a certain amount of logging going on up the Gatineau. People could claim they are employed by so and so, and nobody in the world could do inspection. It would be too expensive.

It is not entirely the seasonal nature of the work; it is the administrative work.

I did suggest this to members of the committee, because they pressed me very hard to have this taken out of the excepted employments, but under the provisions of the bill itself I urged upon them that there can be accomplished something along the lines with which the hon. member for Vancouver South has suggested. If an opportunity is given to the commission to investigate this industry; if they find that it is possible properly to administer it under this act; if they find that the difficulties which I have suggested do not exist—I have no knowledge of the logging industry myself but am simply repeating what I am told—then I can see no reason why under section 86 (a) an extension could not be given and this industry taken out of the list of exceptions; I feel that this might reasonably be done. The reason why it was not inserted originally was not because of its seasonable nature, as hon. members from British Columbia seem to think. It was because of the difficulty of administering it under the present provisions of the bill. We are going to have enough difficulty as it is in setting up the administration. I suggest that an opportunity should be given the commission to investigate and see whether this industry can properly be brought within the administrative scope of the bill. If it can, there is no reason why it should not be.

Mr. GREEN: I do not intend to speak any more; I think it is up to the other members from British Columbia to speak if they have anything to say. I am not going to keep at it, but there are also great difficulties of administration in connection with the sawmill industry, for example. Under this proposed amendment to paragraph (c) you have said to the new commission, in effect, "You must go to British Columbia and investigate these sawmills, planing mills, shingle mills and wood-processing plants in order to see whether or not in your opinion they are reasonably con-