

Mr. STIRLING: That is quite interesting and illuminating, but it does not tell me what I want to know. Is the employee in a packing house, wherever it may be, an insurable person or not?

Mr. McLARTY: Yes, he is an insurable person.

Mr. STIRLING: Does that apply to canneries?

Mr. McLARTY: Yes.

Mr. GREEN: This is the section which sets out the employees who are to be covered by the bill. It is the control section, controlling the schedule. Could not further consideration be given to employees engaged in logging, particularly in British Columbia? The committee have recommended a change in paragraph (c) of part II of the first schedule which in effect makes employees in wood processing plants eligible for unemployment insurance only if in the opinion of the commission there is reasonably continuous employment in their operations. As the minister knows, in the logging industry conditions in British Columbia and conditions in eastern Canada are entirely different. In the east the occupation is seasonal; men work in the logging camps in winter and on the farm in summer. On the Pacific coast the situation is entirely different. The government in this bill have seen fit to go so far as to enable employees in sawmills, planing mills, shingle mills and wood processing plants to come under the plan. I would most strongly urge upon the minister that he extend that a bit further by including logging camps. Lumbering, which word describes the whole industry, is the main industry in our province, and as this bill now stands, many thousands of men in the industry cannot be taken in under the plan. In fact, three of our main industries are not adequately covered—lumbering, fishing and agriculture. Representations have been made to the government by the minister of labour of British Columbia. I wonder if the minister would read the letter he received from Mr. Pearson.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): It is a telegram.

Mr. GREEN: It will show the representations which the provincial government have made. A press report appearing in the *Vancouver Province* of July 20 states:

The minister of labour said B.C. is mainly concerned with putting workers in the lumber industry under the bill. They are now specifically excluded largely on the grounds that variation in unemployment in the industry would disrupt the financial aspects of the scheme.

[Mr. McLarty.]

He went on to say that he was telegraphing the Minister of Labour here to the effect that variations in lumber employment were not serious enough to impair the scheme. Mr. Pearson went on to make this significant statement:

We have information, for instance, that the lumber industries of Washington and Oregon are included in the U.S. scheme.

And they are working under practically the same conditions as our lumbermen in British Columbia. If that industry can be included in the Pacific coast states, it should be included in the Canadian scheme. The minister said further:

They have a basis for calculating the variance in employment and also for suspending the scheme when there is an enforced shutdown. These principles might be applied in covering the British Columbia lumbering industry. They also open the way for the inclusion of several of our other seasonal occupations.

That is the statement of a man in British Columbia who probably knows more about conditions in the industries in that province than any one else, and this government should pay attention to what he says and not omit to cover that great industry simply because in eastern Canada conditions are so different. This is one of the type of things that annoy the people on the Pacific coast. Conditions are different in the east, and therefore it is extremely difficult to get action here to meet conditions on the coast. There is too much red tape. There is no reason why this bill could not be so worded as to give the commission power to cover logging camps.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): They have that power.

Mr. GREEN: The Minister of Pensions and National Health says they have that power?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): They will have it.

Mr. GREEN: I suggest to him that with the amendment recommended by the committee it is doubtful whether they have that power, because the amendment to the schedule exempts employment in lumbering and logging exclusive of such sawmills, planing mills, shingle mills and wood processing plants as are, in the opinion of the commission, reasonably continuous in their operation. The very fact that the commission is given power in the case of sawmills and these other branches of the lumber industry mentioned, would, under the rules of interpretation, exclude the power of the commission to deal with logging camps. It would have been better to leave out the words "in the opinion of