

Industrial Relations

the rule that the clauses shall not be discussed seriatim is that on second reading, when we are dealing with the principle of the bill, we should not deal one by one with the mechanics required to implement that principle, or the details involved in carrying out that principle, as set out in the bill. I am listening with considerable interest to the point the hon. member is making, but it seems to me that there is a good deal of merit in the well-established practice that on second reading we should deal with the principle of the bill and leave the discussion of details until we get into committee.

Mr. Aiken: I would not go so far as to say that the rule can be circumvented merely by reversing the order of the clauses as the hon. member suggests. I think it is very well understood that the reason for this rule is that in committee we consider each of the clauses separately and then go through the bill considering it clause by clause. But if it is not proper for a member in speaking to pick out a certain clause and say, "There is a principle to be found in this clause and I wish to discuss that principle," then it would be the duty of the Speaker to call the member to order if he felt the member had gone beyond the point of discussing the principle and was merely discussing various clauses. I believe it would be a matter for the Speaker to decide at what point a member was not following the rules and was merely reversing the order, but I do not think going from clause 10 to clause 7 or 8 would necessarily be that.

Mr. Speaker: Seeing that the hon. member has addressed himself to the remarks I made perhaps I may say that the principle to be followed is stated in Beauchesne in citation No. 656, in these words:

The second reading of a bill is that stage when it is proper to enter into a discussion and propose a motion relative to the principle of the measure. On the motion for the second reading, it is out of order to discuss the clauses of the bill.

It may be a question on which there would be a difference of opinion at any one time whether in referring to a clause you are actually discussing the clause or the principle of the bill, because the principle is of course wrapped up in the bill itself. I may say, too, I think there is no particular significance in the word "seriatim" although it is mentioned by Bourinot and it would be obviously improper to go through the clauses of the bill one after another. I called the hon. member's attention to what he had been doing because he had been doing just that to some extent. He had gone through three clauses and was about to enter into a discussion of a fourth clause, which to my mind

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

was a discussion of the machinery for carrying out the principle of the bill rather than a discussion of the principle involved in the bill, and that is why I raised the point.

I appreciate the attention he has drawn to Bourinot, but it seems to me you have to be guided in each case by the necessity of referring to the clause only in order to derive the principle, and if that is so it is proper to enter into a consideration of the wording of the clause but not beyond that.

Mr. Aiken: I take it, Mr. Speaker, that you have come to the conclusion that I was on the point of discussing the bill seriatim. I had just about concluded my remarks and said all I intended to say on the general principle. I thank you, Your Honour, for your ruling.

Mr. R. J. McCleave (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise to speak to a C.C.F. motion with over 20 minutes to go because on three previous occasions when I rose to speak on motions, bills, resolutions and what not, sponsored by hon. gentlemen in that group I had to content myself with observations well within a two minute period, and that of course gave rise to their drawing the unjustifiable inference that I was attempting to talk out their measures. Happily today we have still 22 minutes at our disposal. I will be reasonably brief and there will still be opportunity to vote on the measure which I regard basically as a sound one.

I noticed in the November 1957 issue of Canadian Labour the following paragraphs which are germane to this debate. I am aware, Mr. Speaker, that in quoting them I am repeating what my friend the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has already quoted, but since the previous debate occurred approximately two months ago perhaps it would be wise to refresh our memories. I am referring to an article dealing with an appearance before the dominion government of the Canadian Labour Congress on October 21, and at page 17 these words occur:

But the dominion should not confine itself to doing as well as the best of the provinces. It should give a lead. It should, specifically, establish a legal maximum work week of 40 hours and a legal minimum wage of \$1 an hour. This is not really a very drastic proposal. About 65 per cent of all plant workers in manufacturing now have a standard work week of 40 hours or less. So have all railway workers, and a host of others. The 40-hour week is, indeed, now the predominant practice, and its legal enforcement would merely give a smallish minority of workers what the vast majority already enjoy. As for the minimum wage, there must be precious few workers in industries under dominion jurisdiction who are not getting at least \$1 an hour. In some