

of Quebec against this encroachment on the liberty of the subject, and there were quite a number of members on our own side of the house who spoke against the measure, but finally it was enacted. It is interesting to observe that to-day it is a member from the province of Quebec who proposes that the law shall be made stricter at least in one particular.

When my hon. friend introduced a similar bill last year I gave consideration to it, and had the bill come up for second reading I would have supported it. I have no reason to-day to change my attitude. There is no doubt that in the province of Quebec—I do not know whether it is the same in the other provinces—this law has not been observed by certain big corporations as well as it should have been, and labour unions have been protesting strongly against violations of the law and asking that some amendment should be made. When proceedings are taken in the courts against offenders—and it is the attorney general of the province who has to authorize the issuing of proceedings before the courts—a corporation, when it is fined, pays the fine, and that is all there is to it. My hon. friend seeks to make the managers, the men who are in charge of the concern, responsible as well and to subject them to fine and imprisonment, to which the corporation is not subject.

There is one change I would suggest in the wording of the amendment. My hon. friend uses the words "the same" penalties. I think that would be equivocal, because it might mean one penalty payable either by the corporation or by the directors or the managers, and when the bill is in committee I shall suggest that the word "similar" be substituted for the words "the same," so that there will be no doubt that it will hit both the corporation and the directors or managers.

I congratulate my hon. friend upon having taken the initiative in this matter. I may say that the government was to move some amendments in order to meet the wishes especially of the labour unions, and of all citizens who desire that the Lord's Day be observed as it should be.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Johnston (Lake Centre) in the chair.

On section 1—Penalty for directors and officers permitting violation of the act.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East) moved:

That the words "the same" in line 16 be struck out and the word "similar" inserted in lieu thereof.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. BENNETT: I wonder whether the Minister of Justice has considered the question of the use of the word "permits" in the proposed amendment.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): Where?

Mr. BENNETT: In the twelfth line. It would seem obvious that it is quite unfair to endeavour to convict a person of permitting something when he may know nothing about it. It is "a director, an officer, a superintendent or an employee. who authorizes, directs or permits any such last mentioned employee. " I think the hon. gentleman who has charge of the bill will have his object met if he limits it to "authorizes or directs", because I can see great difficulties about using that word "permits." It might become a matter of serious moment if it were put forward for prosecution purposes by some person who had ill will or ill feeling, because the directors might be said to "permit" something.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): Some under-foreman or similar employee might be responsible.

Mr. BENNETT: Quite.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): If the hon. member has no objection to the amendment suggested by the right hon. leader of the opposition—

Mr. BRUNELLE: I have no objection.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): —I move:

That the words "or permits" in the twelfth line be struck out and the word "or" inserted after the word "authorizes" in the eleventh line.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

CRIMINAL CODE

PROVISION AGAINST REFUSAL TO EMPLOY OR DISMISSAL FOR MEMBERSHIP IN TRADE UNIONS

The house resumed, from Tuesday, February 15, consideration of the motion of Mr. Woodsworth for the second reading of Bill No. 4, to amend the criminal code.

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Winnipeg North Centre): Since the house is in such an agreeable mood to-night, I hope that it will give favourable consideration to this bill, which seeks to guarantee labour the right to organize. When I was interrupted by the "nine o'clock" the other evening, I was pointing out that the trades unions have been urging legislation along this line. The follow-