

Industrial Relations

by the hon. member, and also in a bill put forward by the Minister of Labour in relation to the same matter.

The other section to which I should like to refer is clause 5. Clause 5 is a principle which I think was well placed in this particular bill. It does not seem at first glance that it is necessarily a part of a minimum wage bill. It merely requires an employer to provide any necessary special wearing apparel, equipment and so forth to an employee without any deduction being made in this respect. However, on more careful examination it can be seen that there might be a deduction made by an employer which could have the effect of indirectly reducing the minimum wage established by the act. In other words, where an employer felt that he could make deductions indirectly, he would be prevented from doing so by this particular clause.

I should like to refer also to the principle contained in clause 11 of the bill. I had occasion while speaking on a previous bill of a similar nature to take some objection to this type of provision. There is a great tendency to increase the burden of bookkeeping on the employer. We all know that in these days employers are required to do a good deal of bookkeeping for the government of Canada in connection with income tax deductions, workmen's compensation where it applies in the provinces, the deduction and charging of unemployment insurance, making numerous returns and the keeping of a great number of books and records for the government.

So far as this clause imposes on an employer the necessity of setting up and creating a separate set of books merely to indicate that he is paying the minimum wage of \$1 an hour, I think it is wrong and I do not agree with it. I think the normal books set up at the present time to comply with the numerous government requirements should be sufficient record to show whether or not an employer is in fact paying his employees the minimum wage, particularly when the bill relates to federal government employees and employees of services and businesses allied with the federal government. In all such cases it must be recognized that fair and complete books are already kept, and I think it is unnecessary to set up any separate or additional bookkeeping system merely to prove that an individual employer is paying the minimum wage provided by the bill.

Of course in clause 12 there is provision for an extension—

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member has been allowed to proceed with the discussion of three separate clauses of the bill on the 96698—248

basis that they each introduce a principle, but I am doubtful that the principle is any more than the principle of the establishment of a minimum wage. The opportunity will more properly arise to discuss the clauses of the bill when the bill goes to committee. While I do not want to be too rigid about what is the principle of the bill and what is not, I think the hon. member is going into more detail than he should at this stage.

Mr. Aiken: Mr. Speaker, if I might speak for a moment on this point which Your Honour has raised, I would point out that the same point was raised previously in connection with another bill on which I was speaking. At that time the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre suggested I should not be able to refer to individual clauses of the bill. After that I took the trouble to look into the question, and if Your Honour would permit me I should like to say a few words on it. I referred to the Canadian books which are available in order to find what has been the actual practice.

I do submit first, Your Honour, that every bill presented to the house is merely a number of clauses, a group of clauses. We cannot merely say this is a bill but there are no clauses in it. In order to establish the principle we have to consider the individual clauses. My understanding of the rule as it has been established by custom in the British houses of parliament and here in the House of Commons is that a member should not be permitted on second reading to discuss the clauses of a bill *seriatim*—and the word *seriatim* which I looked up in the dictionary, particularly in Murray's new English dictionary, volume 8, which is to be found in our library, is as follows: "one after another, or one by one in succession."

Mr. Speaker, I should like to suggest that the true statement of this rule is to be found in Bourinot's fourth edition at page 511. This is a Canadian book, and at page 511 it states:

On the motion for second reading it is out of order to discuss the clauses *seriatim*.

I made a particular point, Mr. Speaker, of not discussing the clauses *seriatim*. I did feel that several of the sections raised individual points and principles which ought to be discussed.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Would the hon. member permit a question? Do I understand that he is suggesting that he avoids breaking the rule if instead of taking the clauses in numerical order—one, two, three, four, five, six and so on—he takes them in the order two, six, four, five, one, three or in some such order as that, other than in succession? Surely the meaning of