

*Industrial Relations*

on the principle that the members of this cabinet and the members of our party at that time voted, and that the particulars of the bill were not then being considered because the vote was then taken on second reading.

Some criticism has been made of the bill providing for exemptions. I must say that, as was said before, all the provincial statutes on this subject provide for exemptions, the majority of which do so by orders in council or on the order of a board or commission.

Other points were brought forward by other members who have participated in this short debate. I wish to thank them again very much for their suggestions, Mr. Chairman. My last remarks will be to this effect. We hope that this bill will receive favourable consideration by all members of this house because we feel that it is a step in the right direction in the field of labour legislation.

**Mr. McIvor:** Mr. Speaker, may I ask the minister a question? Does this bill apply to both sexes, men and women, equally?

**Mr. Starr:** That is right.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the motion?

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Rea in the chair.

On Clause 1—*Short Title.*

**Mr. Barnett:** I do not intend to make any extended remarks on clause 1 of this bill, Mr. Chairman. However, in view of the rather disjointed way in which the subject matter of it has been under discussion during this session, with the two bills being under discussion at various times over a long period of weeks, perhaps I might state at the outset that on previous occasions, either on the bill introduced by the Minister of Labour or the bill introduced by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, I have made clear my own view that the provision of two weeks' vacation after one year of service would have been a much more desirable provision for us to have. I certainly agree with the position which was just taken by my colleague the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, namely that in approaching the discussion of this whole matter we should view the need for an annual vacation as something which belongs to people as a matter of right rather than as a matter of a handout on the part of an employer.

I was attempting to follow closely the remarks made by the minister in closing the debate at the second reading stage, and there was one statement which he made, if I heard him correctly, which has me rather puzzled.

[Mr. Starr.]

I should like him, if he would, to clarify a little bit just what he had to say in this connection. Am I correct in understanding it was his suggestion that if this bill were to provide for two weeks' vacation after one year of service, it would be providing by law something which would exceed in its provisions what is contained in the collective bargaining agreements now in effect across the country? That is what I thought I heard the minister say and I was very much surprised to hear it. If I misunderstood the minister, I should be glad if he would clarify that statement for me now before I go any further.

**Mr. Starr:** Mr. Chairman, when I made mention of the fact that it would exceed what is provided under the collective bargaining agreements, I meant the bargaining agreements that are prevalent amongst federal employees or persons who are in the employ of federal undertakings. I did not refer to those in private industry.

**Mr. Barnett:** I thought that was a point on which I should be clear because I would not want to launch an argument against the minister on something where we disagreed as to the facts. As has already been pointed out several times during the discussion of this subject, the provision that those of us in the C.C.F. group have been arguing for is something which is enjoyed by law in the province from which I come and in one or two other provinces of the country. I know that a good many of our collective agreements contain provisions which are better than the minimum requirements set out in the law.

I simply want to say that I am genuinely glad to see this bill being introduced from the government side of the house. I think it is some recognition of the fact that the time has come when this principle of the need of people for holidays should receive recognition in the statutes of the country. To the extent that this principle is written into law, to that extent at least it is a recognition that these things come by right.

I may have some further questions to ask as we get into detailed discussion of the clauses of the bill. However, I wanted to make my position clear while we had the subject matter under discussion again, and also to clarify for my own satisfaction just what the minister had in mind in his earlier statement on second reading.

Clause agreed to.

Clause 2 agreed to.