

legality of their arrest. That was the cause of the famous telegram of which everyone has heard, which read:

Notwithstanding any doubt I have as to the technical legality of the arrest and the detention at Stony Mountain, I feel that rapid deportation is the best course now that the arrests are made, and later we can consider ratification.

So that the government have every power in their hands if they wish to exercise it, without resorting to section 98.

I will not discuss the Winnipeg strike in detail; I do not see what good purpose that would serve. I placed myself on record fully in 1926 and I have since then held a position of responsibility in relation to matters of this sort, so that I know that all strikes, big or little, are subsequently distasteful to those who participated in them, leaving a feeling of resentment among all parties to the dispute. There is another reason why I do not want to enter into details at this time, whether members of the government will give me credit for it or not. It is that at least one hon. gentleman who was very active in the Winnipeg strike is in bad health to-day and I do not wish to add to his trouble or make it more difficult. The 1919 strike was to be deplored, as are all strikes, and I thought we had heard the last of it. I do not think it is right to bring it up at this particular time because there is no reason for it. We can discuss the merits or demerits of section 98 without going back to the Winnipeg strike. I recall that when I had a more responsible position than I occupy to-day we satisfied or partly satisfied the postal workers in Winnipeg, and I believe that we removed the bitterness from that aspect of the trouble. Then we eliminated the necessity for what was known as the slave pact in Winnipeg. The city council permits its employees under certain conditions to become members of a union, and altogether the bitterness that characterized the Winnipeg affair has fast faded away.

Mr. SPENCE: Why not let it die out then?

Mr. HEENAN: My hon. friend is one of those—

Mr. SPENCE: I say that in all sincerity; you are the only one who is talking about the Winnipeg strike.

Mr. HEENAN: It is dead now so far as I am concerned unless I am compelled to refer to the matter again. Let me say however

[Mr. Heenan.]

that there is no Conservative in this house or in Canada who ought to raise his voice in connection with the Winnipeg strike without hanging his head in shame.

In my opinion, section 98 is not the real cause of resentment; my personal opinion is that it is the manner in which it was enacted in this house. That is what has caused the suspicion with regard to it. All labour organizations I know of in Canada, whether national or international, Conservative or anything else, have put themselves on record time and again in favour of the repeal of section 98. We could do without it before we enacted it and we can do without it now. So far as I can see there is no necessity for it. I hope we shall not enter into any further discussion of the Winnipeg strike. If we do—I am not issuing this as a threat—I shall take some other occasion to go into the subject from A to Z and clean it up once for all. In the meantime I am in favour of the repeal of section 98, because I think we should remove this last cause for the feeling that exists in that part of the country.

Mr. P. A. SEGUIN (L'Assomption-Montcalm) (Translation): May I, sir, express my views and set forth the reasons which will guide me in casting my vote. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth) requests the repeal of section 98 of our Criminal Code, chapter 36 of the Revised Statutes of Canada. This section, in my opinion, aims at suppressing:

"Any association, organization, society or corporation, whose professed purpose or one of whose purposes is to bring about any governmental, industrial or economic change within Canada by use of force, violence or physical injury to person or property, or by threats of such injury, or which teaches, advocates, advises or defends the use of force, violence, terrorism or physical injury to person or property, or threats of such injury, in order to accomplish such change, or for any other purpose, or which shall by any means prosecute or pursue such purpose or professed purpose, or shall so teach, advocate, advise or defend, shall be an unlawful association."

And the repeal of this section is requested by a member whose past record and principles laid down, on many occasions, lead us to believe that he might be associated with one of those societies which, perhaps, have not always in view peace and order in this country. That is my first apprehension. Moreover, it is undeniable that, at present, throughout the country, seditious doctrines are preached and might, perhaps, find adepts, seeing that the