

Industrial Disputes Act

other utility may engage. The Minister of Labour in proposing amendments such as these is entering upon a very large sphere, and, I am afraid, will again be found to be exceeding his powers. Where there is an emergency which is within the four corners of the words used by Lord Haldane in that particular case, such as pestilence, famine or plague, parliament would have power in regard to these works in Canada to afford a remedy. If we adopt this particular amendment and the other amendment which I suggested, which I think is a fair one, I believe it would be a great benefit. But the minister will not accept it. I hope that he will consult the Attorney General of the department of the province which is the authority in the province.

I do not doubt that the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Labour are anxious to keep within their own fields of activity. I think a lot of good will come out of this discussion, both as regard the Dominion field and the municipal field. I do not see the object of rushing this measure through to-day. The amendment might be printed and the matter considered another day.

Mr. MURDOCK: I do not think my hon. friend realizes that this amendment is exactly similar to the amendment passed last year and the year before, and of course is only intended to apply to public works or undertakings as set out in Bill No. 25, which is before the House now.

Mr. BAXTER: That is all that can apply.

Mr. MURDOCK: Yes.

Mr. BAXTER: It cannot touch the municipalities at all.

Mr. MURDOCK: No, of course not. I hope my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Church) will agree with me in this. It seemed inadvisable to propose this amendment, which has been I think generally if not unanimously concurred in by the House of Commons on two previous sessions, until we found out what the House was going to determine in regard to section 2A which we have dealt with. As we have dealt with section 2A, I hope the hon. member for North Toronto will permit us to pass the three additional amendments which were adopted by the House during the last two sessions of parliament.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

Mr. MURDOCK: I move that section 58 of the said act be repealed and the following substituted therefor:

[Mr. Church.]

58. Any employer declaring or causing a lockout or making effective a change in wages or hours contrary to the provisions of this act shall be liable to a fine of not less than one hundred dollars, nor more than one thousand dollars for each day or part of a day that such lockout or change exists.

Mr. BAXTER: I should like to ask the minister how the employer can make effectual the change in the hours if the employees do not accept the change.

Mr. MURDOCK: It seems to me that is the trouble. A number of disputes occurred in the past because employers, possibly with notice to the employees, have made effective as of a given date a changed rate of wages and certain changes in the hours of work. The employees have protested and said, "We do not want it, we will not accept it. We do not think you should do that." This amendment contemplates that an arbitrary, hurried change of that kind could not be made, if it resulted in a dispute, until the dispute had been inquired into.

Mr. BAXTER: I am not quite clear about it. My right hon. leader (Mr. Meighen) handed me a copy of the amendment. The amendment to section 57 provides at the end:

If either party uses this or any other provision of this act for the purpose of unjustly maintaining a given condition of affairs through delay, and the board so reports to the minister, such party shall be guilty of an offence, and liable to the same penalties as are imposed for a violation of the next preceding section.

That is, if the party uses it for the purpose of delay. There seems to be no penalty for the violation of section 57, except what is contained in sections 58 and 59, one relating to the employer and the other to the employee.

Mr. MURDOCK: That is correct.

Mr. BAXTER: I see the reason for it.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY

SECRETARY OF STATE

The House in committee of Supply, Mr. Marcell (Bonaventure) in the chair.

Civil government—Secretary of State; salaries, \$121,640; contingencies, \$21,500.

Hon. A. B. COPP (Secretary of State): I am glad to be able to report that we have a reduction both in the salaries and the number of employees in the department. The number of employees has been reduced