

yet, despite their long term of faithful service, they are not acknowledged as permanent employees and are not covered in the Civil Service Superannuation Act. I am suggesting that these people about whom I am now talking, the stenographers and the amanuenses, are still not covered by this bill, but they should be.

If I may traverse my steps for a moment I am suggesting that so far as the printers and the char men are concerned they may be covered, but it is up to the treasury board. We hear that the treasury board will include the printers, but we have had no assurance that they will include the char men and messengers who are working here in this building. I hope that the minister—I will forgive him for what he said yesterday by way of a crack on this point if he does not do it again—will not make some comment about our interest in making security in this measure widespread being too far-reaching. After all, this sort of thing is becoming quite the concern of the government at the present time, and I feel that some effort should be made to extend coverage to these people.

While I am on my feet, and while I am speaking about the employees of the House of Commons, there is one other suggestion of a more immediate nature that I should like to make. This session of the house has lasted for some considerable time, and it has now been decided to sit right through until eleven o'clock on Saturday nights for the remainder of the session. That may be all right for us. We agreed to it the other day, but it seems to me it is a little too much to ask of these young boys around here, the pages who serve us so faithfully and well and so willingly. It is a little too much to ask them to work the long hours they have been working, from early Monday morning right through until eleven o'clock Saturday night. I hope that someone, the Clerk of the House or His Honour, the Speaker, may be able to make some arrangement whereby a number of them can be let off at one o'clock to-morrow, and others of them next Saturday. Let us have just two or three of them around here for Saturday afternoons for the remainder of the session.

Would the minister answer my question about the likely action of the treasury board with respect to the specific groups I named?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: In spite of the blandishments and the inducements of the hon. member and the admiration I have for the amanuenses and all the other charming young ladies one sees about the halls of this building, I cannot undertake to say what regulations will be made and what classes will be included. I cannot go beyond saying, as I said before, that

this bill has been brought into the house to provide machinery whereby the representations that have been made and given serious and sympathetic consideration can be met and satisfactorily settled. I cannot go beyond that. I was told that there was one class of employees where the turnover was very, very rapid. There was an average of perhaps not more than three or four months' service. I do not know which one it is, and I am not in a position, without investigation, to express even an opinion for myself and much less am I in a position to express for other members of the treasury board what their judgment would be upon a factual examination with respect to any class.

Mr. EDWARDS: With regard to subparagraph (i) of paragraph (b) of section 1, I submit this case. A man is an employee of the government. He has been paid on an hourly rate; we will say a dollar an hour. He works eight hours a day and six days a week. His pay would amount to \$48 a week. Is he in receipt of a salary as contemplated by subparagraph (i); and how would you compute it at an annual rate when he is paid on an hourly rate? Do I understand the subparagraph to mean if he is in receipt of a salary which, computed at an annual rate, would amount to at least \$600, or alternatively, is in receipt of an annual remuneration which amounts to at least \$600? That is the ambiguity which I think is bothering my hon. friend, and it certainly is puzzling to me.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: When we come to section 4, paragraph (h) subparagraph (ii) my hon. friend will find that the method of computing rates of salary reads:

The method of computing their rates of salary as annual or monthly rates or as rates in respect of any other period for which it is necessary to compute such rates for the purposes of this act,

—will be determined by the regulations.

Mr. ADAMSON: There was a time when the employees of the library, some of whom had been actually working there, I understand, for ten or fifteen years, were classed as temporary employees under the Civil Service Act. Is there a section in this bill that will prevent that? Is there a section that will permit an employee of the library or any other branch of the service who has been employed for a number of years being made a permanent employee? This was brought up in the library committee a year ago. I do not know whether any satisfactory answer has yet been given.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: The employees of the library are employees of the House of Commons, I understand, and also civil servants.