

*Unemployment Insurance*

brought in an amendment. Would it not be better to wait until we come to that amendment? The hon. member asked me to read a rather lengthy telegram received from the minister of labour of British Columbia. It is on the record on page 204 of the minutes of proceedings and evidence of the special committee, so I hope he will excuse me for not reading it.

Mr. GREEN: Well, I have it here; I will read it.

Mr. McLARTY: Does my hon. friend not think it would be better to wait until we come to the proper schedule?

Mr. GREEN: I am quite in order in raising this point under this section; I do not see why we should wait.

The CHAIRMAN: It is quite in order when, in a clause of a bill a schedule is referred to, to discuss matters relevant to the clause and the schedule, but it is not in order to suggest an amendment to a schedule before we reach the schedule.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The hon. gentleman is only giving notice.

Mr. NEILL: Tentatively.

The CHAIRMAN: No notice need be given of an amendment. In the course of a discussion of a bill in which reference is made to a schedule, reference may be made to that schedule. But the schedule must be discussed separately from the various clauses and sections of the bill. In May's *Parliamentary Practice*, page 411, I read:

Schedules to a bill are considered, as a rule, after new clauses are disposed of, and they are treated in the same manner as clauses. When the schedules have been considered, new schedules are offered.

Therefore we must consider the schedules of the bill consecutively, as we consider the clauses of the bill.

Mr. GREEN: That is what I was trying carefully to do; it was the hon. member for Comox-Alberni who raised the question of an amendment to the schedule.

The CHAIRMAN: I pointed out to the hon. member for Comox-Alberni that his amendment was offered too soon.

Mr. McLARTY: Might I suggest, is it fair that we should discuss this matter at this time and then have another discussion when the hon. member for Comox-Alberni deals with precisely the same matter? Could it not stand and could we not later deal with both at once?

Mr. GREEN: I started this, not the hon. member for Comox-Alberni. Why should [Mr. McLarty.]

I have to wait until his amendment comes up, perhaps not before next Wednesday, in order to have a discussion on this subject? I think, with all due deference, that both the committee and myself are entitled to have an explanation from the minister at this time.

The CHAIRMAN: But I would point out to the hon. member that although reference can be made to the schedule, we must not accept the idea that the schedule is under consideration by the committee. Standing order 58, subsection 2, is always applicable. Reference can be made to the schedule because it is related to the clause of the bill, but the schedule itself is not yet before the committee.

Mr. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, this telegram which was sent by the minister of labour of British Columbia to the Minister of Labour here reads as follows: I shall not quote the whole of it, but that part which is vital states:

Newspaper reports indicate that the present measure provides insurance for less than one-half of the workers in British Columbia and excludes several of our major industries especially lumbering, fishing and agriculture. Our government believes that an effort should be made to cover a large number of workers and cannot see any good reason why the lumber industry should be excluded as returns made to our department by all branches of the lumbering industry including logging—

I stress those words.

—show that there is not an unreasonable variation in employment throughout the year certainly in our opinion not large enough to justify the exclusion of this industry. All branches of the lumbering industry are included in unemployment insurance measure in operation in states of Washington and Oregon and I find that they have employed a method of dealing with industry taking into consideration the variance in employment and also providing for exclusion under certain conditions and during certain periods which fully covers any objections that might be raised against the inclusion of the lumbering industry and which also makes it possible to include other seasonal industries which are not at present included in our act.

I would ask the minister now to give us the reason why logging on the Pacific coast cannot be included in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not think the question is at all in order, because the various classes of employees are dealt with in the schedule. The only point before the committee at this moment is whether section 13 as drafted is proper. I do not believe it is in order to discuss at the present time whether the schedule should be changed. The only subject matter of section 13 is that there should be a schedule of employments, and that the provisions of this bill should apply to the persons mentioned in these schedules.