in the previous debate that was offensive to the union. It is found at page 561 of *Hansard* and reads as follows:

My hon. friend knows it, and I shall tell him something more. One of his friends probably ran for office in the union, but he was not successful. He was defeated by 3 to 1. He knows it, and I need not be any more specific about it. He ran on the very same issue, and he was defeated by the men he was supposed to fight for, who were not interested in his policy.

Whatever the hon. member for Temiscouata meant by that statement, the members of the union took it to mean, and regard those words in print as implying, that the members of that union do not support the policy of the international typographical union which calls for the forty-hour week. Their answer to that is in a brief part of their letter to the hon. member for Temiscouata. If I may read it, then as far as I am concerned that can be the end of it. This is from the letter signed by Mr. LeBlanc and Mr. Fry to the hon. member for Temiscouata, dated November 5. As I say, the letter states that a copy was sent to me. This is their answer to the point I have just been discussing:

The same *Hansard* also attributes to you the statement that a former union official was defeated in the last election because the members of the union did not support his policies in regard to the printing bureau. Nothing could be further from the truth.

In so far as the policies of the union are concerned in relation to the printing bureau, including the institution of the five-day week, the withdrawal of order in council P.C. 6190, etc., there has been no change whatever, neither on the part of the union officers nor the employees in the bureau.

The policy of the union regarding the five-day week, P.C. 6190 and working conditions in general in the bureau have been stated repeatedly by this union and is in line with the policy of the allied printing trades throughout Ontario, a fact attested to by the two resolutions passed by the Ontario federation of printing trades, copies of which we enclose. The federation, and this union, have repeatedly called attention to the fact that the government's labour policy, as applied in the printing bureau, is undermining the working conditions of the entire industry throughout Ontario and western Quebec.

I leave it at that, Mr. Chairman. What these men in the union wanted made clear was that, despite a change of officers in the union—there was a change in presidency; the secretary is still the same person—their adherence to the forty-hour week policy of the I.T.U. is beyond question.

Mr. Pouliot: Mr. Chairman, this is most unfair. I want the hon. gentleman to read my answer to that.

Mr. Johnston: Nobody wants to hear it.

Mr. Pouliot: When the hon. member started to read part, he must continue. Why should he stop there, in telling the story of the union,

Public Printing and Stationery Act and not mention my answer? I cannot understand such an action by an hon, gentleman who is as fair as he is.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, have I your permission to respond to the hon. member's request?

Some hon. Members: Go ahead.

Mr. Knowles: May I say that I am willing to do whatever the hon. member wants in this respect. I will make one suggestion, though—

Mr. Pouliot: It is not my wish; it is for hon. members to say.

Mr. Knowles: I want to make one suggestion, to save time. I said earlier that there were three points. I have already discussed two of the points or rather I had already discussed two of the points before the hon. member came in, and he arrived as I was discussing the third. My suggestion is that since I have read from their letter only the part dealing with the question of the adherence of the union to the five-day week policy, that I should now read—

The Chairman: Order. May I suggest to the hon. member that he read only the answer, because it seems to me that this whole debate is out of order.

Mr. Knowles: That is just what I was going to say, that I thought it would be better if I limited my quotation from the letter from the hon. member for Temiscouata to the part in which he answered this point.

Mr. Pouliot: Let us hear my answer from the lips of the hon. gentleman in the first place.

Mr. Sinclair: Read it well.

An hon. Member: Put some feeling in it.

 $\mathbf{Mr.}\ \mathbf{Knowles:}\ \mathbf{This}\ is\ the\ paragraph\ which\ deals—$

Mr. Pouliot: Oh, no. Read it from A to Z, from alpha to omega.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, I do not feel that I should read the whole of the hon. member's reply—

Mr. Pouliot: Oh, oh.

Mr. Knowles: —unless I am given time to read the whole of the letter to which the hon. member's letter was in reply. Let us make it fair both ways. The only part I read to the committee, from the letter written to the hon. member by the union was the three paragraphs dealing with this question of the five-day week policy.

An hon. Member: Read the whole thing.
An hon. Member: Table the whole letter.