

With regard to the schedule itself, it will be considered in due course, like any other clause of the bill, under the provision I have read.

Mr. GREEN: Perhaps I would be in order if I asked the Minister of Labour if it would not be possible to word this section in such a way that where industries are working under entirely different conditions in different parts of the country, there would be more elasticity in the bill; this section should be wide enough to cover conditions governing industry in the maritimes as well as conditions governing industry on the Pacific coast.

Mr. McLARTY: I wonder if this section might be allowed to stand in the meantime, and I will give consideration to the suggestion of my hon. friend. I think the commission would have power to do what he has mentioned, because it has the right to remove anomalies, but I should like to look into that point and see how far that power goes. As I understand it, the hon. member's thought is that there should be schemes which would apply in certain areas of the country but not throughout the country generally.

Mr. GREEN: I think the government are attempting an impossibility in that they are trying to make the scheme too rigid. We have in Canada what is called a lumber industry. In the maritime provinces lumber industry means one thing; in British Columbia it means something else, and perhaps in Ontario still something different. The government have presented the bill in such a form that there is just one big blanket covering the entire industry, and there is no provision to meet the different conditions which exist in different parts of the country. Canada is so far-flung and conditions vary so much in different sections that I think the bill should be more elastic.

Mr. McLARTY: I would suggest that this section stand.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Before that is decided, may I respectfully suggest that the Chairman should reconsider his ruling. This is perhaps the most important section of this bill; and to say that that under this section we cannot discuss the several items appearing in the second schedule as excluded employments is a ruling which to me appears quite impossible. A schedule is not part of a section. A section is referable to a schedule, but a schedule to a statute is not part of the statute itself. This is the very section under which this discussion should take place.

The CHAIRMAN: Then I can suggest a remedy which may meet the views of the

hon. gentleman. It is that, by unanimous consent, section 13 and the schedule be considered together.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That is quite all right. That would be splendid.

The CHAIRMAN: By unanimous consent that may be done, if it is deemed advisable. I do not know if it is.

Mr. McLARTY: In that event I would suggest that the section stand. I have no objection whatever to that course being followed.

Mr. NEILL: Would that mean that the vote would be taken on the two together?

The CHAIRMAN: No. They may be considered together and discussed together; and if amendments are suggested by members of the committee, those amendments may relate to either the section or the schedule. In the meantime the minister moves that this section stand.

Mr. ADAMSON: I heard the remarks of the hon. member for Yale, who was discussing something the minister said with regard to packing houses. Do employees of packing houses come under this measure?

Mr. McLARTY: Yes, if they have employment for over twenty weeks in each year.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Ordinarily in Canada a packing house means a meat packing plant, but of course that is a limited application of the term. We have apple packing houses in the maritime provinces. Do I understand that they will come under this scheme only if there is employment for at least twenty weeks?

Mr. McLARTY: They are not specifically mentioned in the exceptions, so they must be included; provided there is employment for twenty weeks.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): If there is twenty weeks of steady employment?

Mr. McLARTY: I do not think it even has to be steady.

Mr. GREEN: In order to make that point clear, will the minister state whether or not horticulture would cover an apple packing plant?

Mr. McLARTY: I would say not.

Section stands.

On section 14—Power to enlarge or restrict excepted employments.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Copies of an amendment to this section were