

the commission" if the minister intended to rely on the broad provisions of section 14. I can see no reason, apart from cumbersome administration here, why logging camps could not be added to paragraph (c) of part II.

Mr. NEILL: I wish to compliment the hon. member for Vancouver South on using almost the exact language I used a few days ago in connection with this subject.

Mr. GREEN: I assure the hon. member I did not copy his speech.

Mr. NEILL: His remarks had a very close resemblance to it. I am not kicking about that because it is all to the good. There is no question about the statements being correct.

Mr. MacNICOL: The hon. member ought to be flattered.

Mr. NEILL: I am flattered. The hon. member for Vancouver South put forward the argument I advanced a few days ago, that it is, possibly owing to a misconception or misunderstanding of, or indifference to, conditions in British Columbia, which differ from the conditions that prevail in the east, that things are as they are. Later on to-night I shall have an opportunity to illustrate the same thing in connection with fisheries.

We appear to live in two different countries east and west of the Rockies. We have a big lumbering industry, logging, where they work all the year round. They may stop a week or two in the hot weather, but it is only occasionally, and they may stop for a couple of weeks if the snow is very deep. But they may go on for years without stopping. That is not the condition here, and legislators in this part of the dominion do not appear to be able to understand conditions in British Columbia. This applies not only to one industry but to many things. The hon. member was right when he contradicted the Minister of Pensions and National Health. The minister said that they had the power now, but under this section lumbering is specifically excluded except for certain sawmills which are admittedly running more or less all the time. I hope the hon. member for Vancouver South will support me when I move the amendment that I intend to submit to the government. By the way, this discussion is out of order, but I suppose it was the hon. member's charming manner that allowed him to get away with it.

Mr. GREEN: On that point I was not out of order because section 13 expressly provides the classes that are exempt.

Mr. NEILL: I was going to take the matter up on the schedule.

Mr. McLARTY: That is the proper place.

Mr. NEILL: I intend to move this amendment; I can state it now and let it simmer in the eastern imagination:

That part II, paragraph (c) of the first schedule be amended to read

Employment in lumbering and logging which are not reasonably continuous in their operation.

Part II gives the list of occupations that do not come under the measure.

That gives the commission an opportunity not to take in little logging outfits running only a few months, but compels the entry of all the larger ones.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is anticipating.

Mr. NEILL: I was just notifying hon. members so that they may be here to-night.

The CHAIRMAN: I am glad the hon. gentleman agrees.

Mr. STIRLING: If the reason for excluding certain operations in lumbering is that they are not continuous, I do not follow the minister's logic in his statement that the handling of apples comes under the provisions of the bill. If ever there were a casual sort of employment, it is the work in the fruit-packing houses. Do not let me be misunderstood; I am not at the present moment arguing for inclusion or exclusion, but I want to know which it is. The packing house work, for instance, starts with cherries; it goes on down through the plums and peaches, et cetera, and may go on until December, but the person employed may work only a matter of a few weeks on end.

Mr. McLARTY: If hon. members will refer to section 16, subsection 1, in which provision is made in the matter of seasonal work, it provides for a person who is employed in an occupation which is seasonal and does not ordinarily extend over more than twenty weeks in any year, and who is not ordinarily employed in any other occupation which is insurable employment.

Mr. STIRLING: That seems to me to counter entirely the minister's statement just now that undoubtedly the packing house employee is in.

Mr. McLARTY: If employed over twenty weeks.

Mr. GREEN: Would the minister make a statement in regard to logging?

Mr. McLARTY: I have no objection, but I understand the hon. member for Comox-Alberni is going to move an amendment dealing with exactly the same matter. It seems to me it is specifically referred to in the schedule. The committee has already