

*Canada Labour Code*

Since I am using the French version of the bill and have received only the English version of the amendments, I wonder if the minister has a French version of the amendments in question. Such a translation would enable us to follow the debate more closely because we often discover discrepancies between the French and English versions when we compare them one with the other. Consequently, I should like to know whether the minister has a French version of the amendments.

[Text]

**Mr. MacInnis:** Mr. Chairman, in common with other hon. members I think this legislation is very commendable. However, it is my opinion that the particular clause we are discussing is rather restrictive. I do not think it is proper that parliament should legislate that a person unfortunate enough to be employed at the minimum wage rate of \$1.25 be restricted to earnings of \$50 a week or, as is the case under clause 8, \$65 a week.

The fourth line in clause 5(1) reads:

—no employer shall cause or permit an employee to work longer hours than eight hours in any day or forty hours in any week.

This is very restrictive. Labour unions and organizations have worked long and hard to bring about the eight hour day and 40 hour week, but we all realize that on industrial contracts, when unions are engaged in wage negotiations, provisions are made so that workers be paid time and a half for overtime, double time for Sundays and holidays, and so forth. It is restrictive to legislate anything on hours of work which would deprive an ambitious person of working overtime if the opportunity be presented him.

This is something which could easily be governed by strengthening the legislation in respect to overtime. On the other hand, this is a protection for the worker. If a man chooses not to work more than 40 hours a week or eight hours a day there is no way in which an employer could discriminate against him.

I realize this legislation will cause improvement in a great number of cases, but I believe it essential that a worker who wants the opportunity should be permitted to earn more than \$50 a week, or as is the case under clause 8, \$65 a week.

**Mr. Hales:** I shall be brief, Mr. Chairman. I am in sympathy with the general intent and purpose of the bill but it has such wide ramifications, and I believe the minister should hesitate before seeking to have it passed. I

[Mr. Ricard.]

first refer to the household goods moving business, these people who have a unique problem in that their busiest season is a short one, from June to September. They have to move goods from one given point to another in the quickest possible time in order to please their customers, and therefore this legislation will be a great burden to them. I ask the minister to consider excluding the furniture moving industry from the provisions of this bill because I believe that it is entirely different from any other type of transportation business.

I am also concerned about interprovincial transportation firms and the hardship this will cause when moving agricultural products to eastern Canada. Eastern farmers have great difficulty securing adequate returns from their farms, and the provisions of this bill will add insult to injury by imposing additional cost on the haulage of grain and cattle by motor transport to eastern Canada. In conclusion, I feel this is legislation by regulation rather than by an act of parliament, which was the minister's original intention.

[Translation]

**Mr. Côté (Chicoutimi):** Mr. Chairman, while we are considering clause 5 of Bill No. C-126, I should like to call the attention of the house to certain remarks made to me by one of my former fellow citizens, Mr. Robert Auclair, now a resident of Quebec city, who, moreover, addressed the same remarks to the Minister of Labour.

I must point out to the minister that Mr. Auclair is a prominent expert in labour legislation and, in addition, has a thorough knowledge of the French language. When he sent his brief to the Minister of Labour about clause 5 and several others, he stressed the importance of wording this bill in international French, that is, by using the same French terms used by the International Labour Organization and throughout the French speaking world.

Therefore, it is most important that the bill should be in excellent French.

In this case, for instance, the words "heures de travail" are used whereas, according to international French, the expression "durée du travail" would be called for. On another point, section 5 speaks of "jours de congé payés" whereas it should refer to "jours fériés".

Such is the case for a number of words that have been translated.

Of course, all the acts proposed to the house were first thought out in English and