

*Industrial Relations*

Mention has been made of the fact that this measure is not as good as some of the acts which are now in existence in the various provinces. I might say that five provinces provide for a vacation of one week after one year's employment, and they are New Brunswick, Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba and Alberta. There are two provinces that provide for a vacation of two weeks after one year, namely Saskatchewan and British Columbia. In addition, Alberta also provides for two weeks after two years, which is in line with the proposal contained in this bill. Manitoba provides for two weeks after three years. It will be seen, therefore, that the bill is equal to or better than the provision made in five of the seven provinces having vacation with pay legislation. There is no provincial legislation, I think, in this field in the provinces of Newfoundland, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island. The New Brunswick legislation is limited in that it applies only to mining and construction, and such related fields as have been brought within its scope by order in council.

Under the circumstances, Mr. Chairman, since all these things were taken into consideration when the bill was drafted, I am afraid that I cannot accept the amendment moved by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

**Mr. Barnett:** I suppose this question can be discussed back and forth across the floor at considerable length, if we desire to do so. I suppose if we kept at it long enough we would reach the point where we would be saying we want it and the government would be saying, we will not give it to you. This state of affairs could continue for hours.

In view of the remarks the minister has made about the very careful consideration he and his colleagues in the government have given to this matter, this might be the appropriate place to put on the record the fact that certain other bodies have also given this matter careful consideration. The distilled consideration of the membership of the entire Canadian Labour Congress on this subject was presented to the government of Canada on October 31, last. Under the heading, "Labour Legislation" found on page 18 of the Canadian labour congress brief, the congress expresses its considered opinion in the following words:

Uniform labour legislation is one of the goals of the congress. Divided jurisdiction makes this difficult. But there are several things which can be done without any constitutional amendment, and which should be done promptly.

The first is to fill the gaps in dominion labour legislation.

We welcome the announcement of a vacations with pay act,—

This brief was presented following the speech from the throne in which the announcement foreshadowing this legislation was made.

We welcome the announcement of a vacations with pay act, and hope it will provide for two weeks after one year's service.

It goes on to say:

But even when this gap is filled there will still be no dominion legislation providing for a legal maximum work week or minimum wages, or paid statutory holidays or a minimum age of employment.

Merely establishing for dominion industries the best provincial standards would be something.

A little later on the congress says:

But the dominion should not confine itself to doing as well as the best of the provinces. It should give a lead.

All I am going to say to the minister at this juncture is that I agree most thoroughly with the point of view expressed by the Canadian Labour Congress in its brief of last October.

**Mr. Martin (Timmins):** I should like to just put one or two questions to the minister. He has just mentioned that this legislation, in its present form, is going to catch up to five of the provinces but will still lag behind two others. Having had some little experience at the bargaining table and heard some of the answers received by labour representatives when they request additional holidays, and so forth, I believe that possibly one of the main reasons why more of the provinces do not have two weeks' vacation with pay legislation is that they say, "Why should we do it when the federal government does not do it?" and so it becomes a vicious circle. The federal government will not do it unless the provinces do it and the provinces will not do it unless the federal government does it. I certainly think, therefore, that the lead should come from here.

I would also like to ask the minister whether there are any other objections to these two weeks, apart from the fact that only two provinces have such legislation at the present time. I have heard of no other reasons, and I would like to know if there are other reasons why this could not be done.

**Mr. Starr:** In answer to the question of the hon. member I would like to say that when he stated this was in line with what five provinces now have, it is in fact ahead of four provinces because actually there are five which provide for a vacation of one week after one year. Alberta has two weeks after two years. With respect to Manitoba we are ahead because that province provides