

Canada Labour (Standards) Code

has been no deferment. I cannot give particulars of these now, but if any hon. member is interested I shall be glad to write giving particulars.

Mr. Howard: May I ask a supplementary question? Rather than having the minister write to individual members, would not the minister undertake to table in the house a resumé or listing of the industries, groups, or parts of industries which have applied for deferment. Could he include in that list those industries with which he has dealt and those which remain outstanding?

Mr. Nicholson: I should like to give that undertaking but I would not be able to do what is asked today because we are working actively—

Mr. Starr: Some time this week, perhaps?

Mr. Nicholson: We are trying to clean up as many applications as we can by the end of the year when the 18 month period is up. I can give an undertaking to file such a list reasonably soon, after the resumption of this session, that would be early in the new year. It is very difficult, with our limited staff and the large number of applications pending, to do that now. Though we have a relatively adequate staff it is small for the volume of work it has to do in such a short time. Rather than meeting the hon. member's wishes now, I think our time could be better used cleaning up some deferments and, where we feel it advisable, refusing deferments, and giving a report as soon as possible as of the end of this year.

Mr. McCleave: I have two points to raise. I mentioned that I thought government employees were not being brought under the provisions of the act. I should have said that those employees work for contractors who treat with government departments. Normally those employees come under the operations of this act. I have in mind specific employees of the cleaning firm which works for the Department of Transport at Halifax International Airport. The provisions of the act have not been applied to these employees, or had not been when I consulted with these employees a few months ago. I presumed that was the situation.

This situation lends itself to correction. I hope that the minister will assure me that I am correct in that inference.

Mr. Nicholson: Mr. Chairman, service contracts come within a third category. Employees affected by service contracts do not

[Mr. Nicholson.]

come under the Fair Wages and Hours of Labour Act. That act applies to the construction industry where any firm of that industry constructs buildings for the federal government. General regulations apply to other government service contracts. It is the government's intention to clear this matter up, an order in council already exists which permits such clearing up. These matters have to be dealt with independently, but I can assure the hon. member that we shall proceed to do so as quickly as possible. If any matters such as the hon. member referred to are brought to my attention or to the attention of my department they will be acted on and investigated promptly.

Mr. McCleave: I have a second point. I thought the minister had told the Leader of the Opposition that regulations were available now. The minister dealt with 34—

Mr. Nicholson: No.

Mr. McCleave: Perhaps I misunderstood the minister. He seemed to indicate that as soon as passage was given to this legislation the package would be quickly unveiled for the stevedores in all parts of Canada. I was wondering what sort of rates the department was thinking of suggesting. Apparently, the rates have been worked out between employers and employees, and presumably the department's rate will be comparable to the existing rates or to rates in similar sections in other legislation. Could the minister give us some indication about what I ask?

• (4:10 p.m.)

Mr. Nicholson: The proposed regulations are intended to deal with two situations only, the eight holidays and what amount should be paid in connection with those holidays and the annual vacations with pay. It should be remembered that in the course of a week employees might work for as many as six employers. They might, of course, work for only one. On the west coast it would be a maximum of about five; on the east coast it might be six, or seven. In answer to a question put by the Leader of the Opposition I stated that we were having further discussions within the next day or two with both workers and employers on the east coast; there seems to be need for further clarification, so I cannot say the regulations have been completed. Nevertheless, the proposed arrangement seems to be generally acceptable to all concerned.