

*Canada Labour Code*

trucking industry in particular is satisfied with the amendment which the minister is proposing to clause 51. There is a great deal of difference between the conditions laid down by the provincial government in respect of this industry and what is proposed in the federal bill which we are considering now. For example, this Bill C-126 makes provision for standard weekly hours amounting to 40 hours. The Ontario legislation provides for 48 hours a week. Overtime permitted under the present bill amounts to eight hours whereas Ontario provides for 12 hours. The bill before us provides 48 hours as the maximum permissible number of hours which can be worked each week—40 hours plus eight hours overtime. In Ontario the total comes to 60, a figure which takes account of the competitive aspect of the trucking industry in the United States which, of course, crosses international boundary lines into Canada, particularly into Ontario. There would be no confusion at all if there were uniformity between the provincial legislation and the federal legislation. But such will not be the case. The legislation will not affect everyone concerned in the same industry in the same way.

The Minister of Labour made a speech on November 19 to the Kiwanis club of Toronto at the Seaway Towers motel, and at page eight of the release of his speech he said, referring to the trucking industry:

They have expressed concern regarding their competitive position in relation to trucking firms operating solely within provincial jurisdictions. I have assured them we will invite the provincial departments of labour to consider jointly practical steps which can be taken to bring about a common approach to the two fields of jurisdiction.

Now, I ask the Minister of Labour this: In view of what he said on November 19, has any approach been made to any of the provincial governments along the lines of this undertaking? Has any assurance been received from any of them that they intend to comply at once or in the very near future with the code which is being proposed here in part I as far as hours of work are concerned? I think this is a vitally important matter and unless it is cleared up there is bound to be a great deal of confusion in the industry.

I should also like to ask the minister whether he is prepared to give the house an assurance that this bill will not apply to the construction industry. If it does, I should like him to tell us what is to be the extent of its application. I believe the Canadian

[Mr. Starr.]

construction industry has a vital interest in knowing whether or not it is affected and I suggest it would put the minds of those concerned at ease if the house could be given this information before we pass these clauses in part I. Perhaps, before we go any further, the minister could give us a list of the industries which are to be affected; perhaps he could tell us which industries have protested to him in respect of the provisions in part I of this bill. Let him tell us whether or not he has apprised these industries of the proposed amendments. Let him tell us what the reaction of these industries has been to his proposals—whether they are satisfied or not. Here I include also the railway running trades—the employees of the railways. Are they satisfied with these amendments or not?

This is the extent of the comments I wish to make at this point. These are the questions which I feel should be answered by the minister before we proceed to pass these clauses in part I. I know that many of my colleagues have further questions to ask with regard to other industries likely to be affected by this part of the labour code.

**Mr. Knowles:** Mr. Chairman, the minister was correct in saying that when this bill was before us on second reading it received the enthusiastic endorsement of the members of the House of Commons. I believe most of us hoped that when the bill reached us in its final shape it would likewise command our enthusiastic support. After all, this is legislation which has been anticipated in this country for a long time and it is good to get it, even though it is so long overdue.

I remind the minister that when the bill was brought in it had four main parts, aside from the administrative aspects of the measure, and that each of these four main parts, dealing with hours of work, minimum wages, annual vacations and general holidays, was a strong provision. We recognize that although very few complaints were made about the other three parts there were a number of complaints about part I, dealing, as it does, with hours of work. We are not surprised that the minister has come forward with some suggested amendments but he will understand it if we, for our part, would like to take a good look at these amendments before we are asked to decide whether or not they go too far.

I have already indicated that we welcomed the strength of this bill when it first came before us. We are not going to take a rigid position and say that it should not be changed