

## APPENDIX No. 4

Mr. MACDONELL.—Perhaps Prof. Skelton might in the light of his experience show what the Bill would cover. For instance, when we come to put in our report—I am merely suggesting this—it would seem to be the proper thing to say that with respect to the Bill committed to us we find in our opinion it applies to so and so, and then give a statement showing what the application of the Bill we have been considering is, and continue from that starting point.

## FEDERAL AND CERTAIN STATE LAWS TO BE COMPARED.

The CHAIRMAN.—I do not know how it appears to the other members of the committee but it seems to me from what Prof. Skelton has given us this morning, that if he could take the United States federal law and compare with it the laws of Wisconsin, Massachusetts and New York, bringing these four measures together and discussing the bearing of one upon the other, it would be very instructive and enlightening—because certainly the Wisconsin and Massachusetts laws seem to be rather direct and specific. Although the New York law is perhaps more far-reaching—also the application of these laws to the federal jurisdiction, would be very helpful, I think, in getting at just what we want here. This is practically what he has done this morning although he has spread the work over a large field.

Mr. MACDONELL.—My idea is apparently the same as yours. The legislation passed by New York, Massachusetts and Wisconsin and the Federal Act are very useful.

The CHAIRMAN.—Yes.

Mr. MACDONELL.—The Wisconsin Act is the latest of any one of those Bills which are before us. The New York Act has gone very far and it has been a good deal hammered out and pounded on. It is a very useful Bill and then there is the fact that our Bill is very similar to theirs. Those four Bills will give us a good deal of information.

Mr. STAPLES.—What is the object of considering the details of these state laws? We do not pretend to go that far, do we, or, to legislate beyond the scope of the federal law which will simply cover the labour employed on federal public works? That is all we intend to do?

The CHAIRMAN.—I think that is so.

Mr. STAPLES.—Why is it necessary to go into the state laws?

The CHAIRMAN.—They help to throw light on the considerations which you have to keep in mind in drafting a federal measure. For instance, these two limitations which it has been found necessary to insert in the New York law, I think it was, are limitations which probably it would be necessary to insert in any federal law. The same reason which would apply in the case of a state would apply to contracts by the federal government, and it is with the view of getting the light of as much experience as possible that we are taking up the matter of the scope of this legislation.

Mr. STANFIELD.—It is too important a Bill to rush through.

Mr. MACDONELL.—Sooner or later we ought to be in touch with the Justice Department, as legal questions will arise as to the Federal jurisdiction and so on. Perhaps that could be left until we have the measure pretty well matured in our minds.

Prof. SKELTON.—Supposing I should present a tentative interpretation of what, it seems to me, is comprised within the scope of this measure.

*By Mr. Verville:*

Q. Of the Canadian Bill?—A. Yes, of the Canadian Bill.

Mr. KNOWLES.—I think perhaps the Professor had better give us what he has in his mind and then we can do what we think best.

The CHAIRMAN.—And a comparison of these other laws.

Prof. SKELTON.—On the points strictly bearing on the Canadian topic.

*By the Chairman:*

Q. Have you been able to ascertain how far the states have gone in the matter of legislating on hours of labour before the Federal legislation was passed? Has the