businesses in separate premises are carried on in separate departments on the same premises, each of those departments shall, for the purposes of this provision, be deemed to be a separate factory or workshop or separate premises as the case may be.

Were I to read that in the public press I am afraid I would not understand the meaning of it. However, I have an opinion with respect to this section. While I have all the confidence in the world in my colleague who happened to be a member of the committee which considered this bill, and while I have confidence in Mr. Moore and the other labour representatives, I cannot agree with what is contained in this section. My experience with organized labour has been such that, when it comes to questions of strikes and matters of that kind, I do not trust the employer. I have very good reason for that stand. In the first place, the section assumes that the worker is responsible for strikes. I say that because under this section he is penalized. However, my experience has been the reverse. I have found that labour disputes have been brought about deliberately by operators to serve certain purposes of their own.

Within the last couple of years we had a good example of this in connection with the union to which I belong. A lockout was in force for thirteen months because of an admitted violation of contract by the operator. This lockout was fought by the international union and the district organization, but the union had to carry the load for thirteen months. In a situation like this, under the provisions of this section, a man who had been locked out in order to serve an operator's purpose would be disqualified.

I think this clause should stand in order that it may be reworded. As the section reads now, I know that organized labour across Canada will consider that it offsets all the good features of this bill. There will be a violent reaction against this section. Provision should be made for some sort of investigation in order to determine the responsibility for strikes, lockouts and so forth. Why should one side be penalized and not the other? In the lockout to which I referred the men used every reasonable means at their disposal to come to an understanding on the question of wages, but the operator took a most unreasonable stand. An operator may bring about a stoppage of work in order to serve his own purpose, and the men will be disqualified from the benefits of this section. I agree with the principle of this bill, but I am afraid organized labour will not be in favour of this section.

Amendment (Mrs. Nielsen) negatived.

Section agreed to.

[Mr. Gillis.]

First schedule, part I, agreed to.

Second schedule agreed to.

On third schedule—Insurance benefit.

Mr. MacNICOL: In the third column of the tabulation of weekly rates the range is from $4.80 to $14.40 for a married person with dependents. There is apparently no difference between the allowance to a man with one dependent and a man with five.

Mr. McLARTY: That is correct.

Mr. MacNICOL: In that respect this bill differs widely from the other act.

Mr. McLARTY: This follows the graded rule.

Schedule agreed to.

On first schedule, part II—Excepted employments.

Mr. NEILL: Part II deals with excepted employments, that is, people employed in these employments will not benefit under the bill. There are twenty-five of these, and I would say that they cover between 85 to 90 per cent of all industry in British Columbia. In other words, so far as British Columbia is concerned, this bill as it stands is little better than eye-wash. A man does not benefit from this scheme if he is employed in agriculture, horticulture, forestry, fishing, lumbering and logging, hunting and trapping, transportation by water, stevedoring, domestic service and many other types of employment. In order to test this part of the schedule, I intend to move an amendment dealing with logging, British Columbia's second largest if not the largest industry. In order to meet the wishes of those who wanted to deal with sawmills and other wood working industries which do not operate continuously, I have worded this amendment as follows:

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

That is, in part, the exact language used in the amendment passed by the committee in connection with sawmills, planing mills, shingle mills and wood-processing plants. I have worded my amendment in order to put it up to the commission to allow employment in lumbering and logging—I have a further amendment to deal with stevedoring and domestic service—which are reasonably continuous in their operations. This afternoon the hon. member for Vancouver South explained most ably the difference between conditions in British Columbia and those in the east. The situation is not fair, or reasonable, or just, and I appeal to the good sense of hon. members in the east to back us up by not imposing upon us conditions