

Canada Labour Code

Other countries have recognized the importance of this factor. Any restrictions to such moves would be contrary to the public's interest.

May we urge you, sir, to recommend that an amendment is incorporated into Bill C-126 before it becomes law, to exclude the household goods moving industry.

Then, Mr. Chairman, another person from my area who is in the same type of business writes as follows:

I am an employee and shareholder in an inter-provincially licensed household goods mover. The legislation before the house would seriously restrict the operation of my company if it were to become law. We would be unable to operate competitively from coast to coast or from Ontario to either coast.

Our business is very seasonal: for example, the Department of National Defence gives us most of their business between July and August and are themselves committed to a policy of summer moving. This, being a branch of the federal government, it would appear that the proposed bill and government policy are at cross purposes.

I also feel rather strongly that I now will have to bring up my children in a country where it appears the willingness to work long and hard will have no benefit and where their work will be restricted to 2,000 hours per year. Surely you, nor no member of parliament, could do your duties inside of 2,000 hours per year. Why then must we be restricted to this figure?

I would point out to you, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the vital economic concern of these two branches, you might say, of the retail service and industry, the small feed mill and the local mover; and I would respectfully ask the minister to govern himself accordingly in the final promulgation of this bill.

Mr. Bell: Mr. Chairman, before the Christmas recess some of us asked questions about this legislation and expressed the fears and apprehensions which were being felt by certain sections of industry as they examined the legislation more closely. I refer in particular to clause 5, which I agree is very important to the entire piece of legislation.

The minister has given us this evening the benefit of his new thinking and has proposed at least two new amendments which seem to be an improvement to the bill. However, as the former minister of labour has outlined on behalf of the trucking industry, I think there will still be some fears and apprehensions about the bill. I think that further assurances will be needed and I want to put forward very briefly the plight of the longshoremen who have a very seasonal type of occupation. I refer to those in the port of Saint John, and I think the situation is about the same at Halifax. These workers have a few precious months of activity, and some of

[Mr. Alkenbrack.]

them might put in 70 hours a week. They must not be penalized, Mr. Chairman, by this legislation.

As I understand the bill, Mr. Chairman, there are three ways in which their problem could be dealt with, and the minister referred to them in Halifax. As I understand it, the averaging section of the bill could be of some use to them. Under clause 35, as the minister has mentioned, their case could be referred for further consideration. Similarly clause 51 could provide a method for dealing with the longshoremen. However, I think that clause 51—we can, of course, ask detailed questions later—might be of only temporary assistance and would have the effect of making the longshoremen think that by agreeing to this someone might be getting a foot in the door of their industry. I think something more definite must come from the minister regarding their situation.

I realize that the minister cannot usurp his authority under these sections of the bill and tell us in advance how some sections of industry are going to be treated, but I do feel that definite assurances will have to be given to the longshoremen and that they should have particular consideration. When the time comes for the minister to reply, either now or later when these clauses come up, I think he should in all fairness be more specific than he has so far. He is on the right track but he just has not gone far enough yet.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Ricard: Mr. Chairman, just a few words. First of all I would like to thank the minister for sending me a French copy of the amendment to clause 7 of the bill. The minister did not have time to answer me a while ago, but I presume that the amendment to that particular clause was not yet ready in French. Since I have before me a copy, which seems to have been typewritten rather quickly, of an amendment to clause 7 of the bill, it seems obvious that the amendments are not ready in French. I would like the minister to tell us if we will get tomorrow a French copy of the amendments to clause 5.

[*Text*]

The Chairman: Shall clause 5 carry?

Mr. Starr: Mr. Chairman, quite a number of questions have been asked which I think should be answered before any part of this bill is passed. We have had an opportunity of considering the proposed amendments to clause 7 of part I, and clause 51. I asked a number of questions regarding these proposed