

Mr. CAHAN: Hear, hear.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): There would be a different law if the other party would commit a crime by refusing to employ.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: The alternative is starvation.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): Yes; but that is why the provinces have intervened and have enacted legislation, which they have a right to enact, but which we cannot do, just by attempting to use the criminal code for that purpose.

I have every sympathy for labour people who join in trade unions. I think no employer should try to prevent them from doing so. But to make it a crime under the criminal code, on a question of contract—because it is a question of contract—is not proper. I cannot follow my hon. friend when he asks me to make it a crime to hire or engage labour to work. I do not think I have the right to do that.

Mr. DUNNING: Nine o'clock.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Conspiracy in restraint of trade originally applied to trade unions. Then exemptions were made for trade unions. Does not this suggest that such matters were within the scope of criminal law.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): The hon. member has said there were exceptions made for trade unions.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Not originally.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): No; it was conspiracy to do something which was a disturbance of peace and order. Surely, if the hon. member reads that section of the criminal code, he will find that it was to prevent a disturbance of order, and there was an exception made for trade unions which exercised the right of picketing in an orderly way.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Not at first.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): It was done to protect labour against prosecution. Surely it was not in any way to do something against labour.

Mr. DUNNING: It is nine o'clock.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): Yes, it is nine o'clock.

[Mr. E. Lapointe.]

## SUPPLY

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Johnston (Lake Centre) in the chair.

### POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Departmental administration, including amount required to pay allowances to typists, grade 1, employed cutting stencils, in accordance with regulations approved by order in council, \$553,020.

Mr. STIRLING: In this vote there is a reduction of approximately \$38,000, but offset against that or perhaps in explanation is a decrease of \$80,000 in the cost of mail bags.

Hon. W. D. EULER (Acting Postmaster General): There is a reduction of \$80,000 in connection with mail bags, and the net decrease on the total vote is \$37,928.

Mr. STIRLING: Did the mail bags not wear out last year?

Mr. EULER: There was a larger supply than usual on hand.

Mr. PELLETIER: There is an item of \$17,450 for travelling expenses. Is that the total amount for the department, or does that cover only the expenses of certain officers?

Mr. EULER: There are six other votes for travelling expenses.

Mr. PELLETIER: What is this one for?

Mr. EULER: These are headquarters' expenses. One item is to cover the cost of representation at the Postal Union Congress in Buenos Aires in March, 1939. The additional allowance for this item is \$6,700.

Mr. PELLETIER: Who were the representatives at that conference?

Mr. EULER: It is to be held in March, 1939, before the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. HEAPS: When we were discussing estimates the other evening we had the other acting Postmaster General (Mr. Power) with us. We were then dealing with the possibility of having a proper balance sheet submitted to the committee so that we would be able to get a better idea of the actual workings of the Post Office Department from a financial standpoint. Mention was made of the fact that when a similar item was before the committee two years ago, we were promised by the Postmaster General (Mr. Elliott), who unfortunately is absent to-night, that something would be done in the way of submitting a more complete statement so that members would have a proper idea of the financial results of the year's operation of the depart-