

The Budget—Mr. Winch

employees, and the five-day week. Mr. Speaker, be that as it may, I think it is terrible and horrible what the Post Office Department of this government is doing in order to try to squeeze the last dollar out of their own employees.

I am not speaking from hearsay at all. When I was in Vancouver last week a postal employees' delegation met me. What did I find? I found something that is not to be found in any employer-employee agreement in the entire Dominion of Canada. The government announces that they will pay overtime rates to their postal employees and that they are now to be on a 40-hour five-day week in some parts of Canada. What are you doing where these employees are on the 40-hour five-day week? You are pulling the dirtiest, lowest stunt ever pulled by any employer in Canada. What are you doing? You say that they are entitled to time and a half overtime rates. O.K. They are on a 40-hour five-day week. The Post Office Department issued an order and I have got it right here. What does it say? It provides that before an employee can collect one cent at the time and a half overtime rate he has to work 48 hours in the week. There is a 40-hour week but the overtime rate does not come into effect unless you work 48 hours in the week.

Show me one union agreement, show me one employer-employee agreement that is as low as that. It means even more than that, Mr. Speaker. If a statutory holiday occurs in a week the employees do not get paid for it at the overtime rate unless they work for forty-eight hours in the week. I have heard of some rotten deals in my life but that is the rottenest I ever heard of. I have the government's own order setting out that although the employees are on a 40-hour week they do not collect the overtime rate of pay unless they work 48 hours. It goes beyond that. May I ask the house leader if he will take note of this? May I, Mr. Speaker, ask the house leader if he will take note of this?

Mr. Abbott: He will.

Mr. Winch: May I ask the house leader to take note of this?

Mr. Abbott: Do not take yourself too seriously.

Mr. Winch: On January 14 I stated, as found at page 1109 of *Hansard*, that the government had in mind changing the night differential in the post office. I now refer

[Mr. Winch.]

the house to page 1146 of *Hansard* of January 15 where it will be found that the minister said:

I believe he also stated that he had been informed that the department was endeavouring to eliminate the night differential granted to postal employees. We have no such thought in mind. I am afraid that he is getting his information from an unreliable source.

That is the statement the Postmaster General (Mr. Cote) made on that date. That order, Mr. Speaker, was put through and the night differential has been wiped out in the postal service. When I said that it was going to be done the minister said no, that I did not have a correct source of information. I have spoken to the postal employees in the city of Vancouver and the night differential has been wiped out. What does this mean? At that time the night differential meant that those who worked for seven hours got paid for eight. The government has now put an order into effect whereby they get a slight increase in wages but not a sufficient amount to make up for the loss of the night differential. This penny-pinching government is stealing a few cents in order to get an extra hour from those who have to work on the night shift in the post offices. You should be darn well ashamed of yourselves. But I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the house leader that the important point is that I was given the lie on the floor of the house by a cabinet minister. It did go into effect.

Mr. Harris: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, it is not in order for any hon. member to make a reference of that kind. If any explanation is needed now—I am sure it will be made later if necessary—may I point out that if the facts are as the hon. member says, and I have some doubt, he is speaking of a date in January when the minister's reference could have been made precisely as it was and yet by government action some weeks later a change could be made. If that is so, the circumstances would not justify the description the hon. member has now given. Therefore I would ask him to withdraw his remarks.

Mr. Winch: I am not withdrawing the remarks. I am going to ask the minister to supply the date of the secret order.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Abbott: This is not the British Columbia legislature.

Mr. Speaker: May I ask the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration what is the remark he is complaining about? I must apologize for not hearing it, but I was being