

incident I am going to bring to his attention appears to me, if all the facts are as given to me one of the worst cases of boycotting honest labour which I have come across in all my experience. I will call the gentleman concerned "R.S." The report he gave me is this. I have known him for a long time. I have known him as an expert electrical engineer and salesman of electrical equipment. I had a long experience myself as head of one of the largest sales staffs in the country, and in my judgment this gentleman has all the characteristics of a natural born salesman. He was most successful in selling electrical equipment, so much so that one company after another sought his services. In due course, according to the information given me, these various companies got together and agreed among themselves that if and when contracts were called for this or that the contract would go to this or that company and the other companies would lay off. This gentleman I have in mind was so highly respected and well-known by the purchasers, particularly the purchasers of large quantities of electrical equipment, that he invariably got orders anyway with the result that, I am told, these various manufacturers agreed among themselves that he should not be employed. I have no reason to doubt this. This man is an honest workman, and he would not have any reason to say anything that was not absolutely honest. That is a case of boycotting, because it prevents a decent, honourable, honest, worthy, intelligent workman from getting a position. He has not been able to obtain work for some time. May I ask the minister this question? If "R.S." sends him the full particulars, substantiated by affidavits, and the facts are as indicated, will he instruct the officials in the investigational branch to inquire into the same and, if they are found as stated, to take the necessary action?

Mr. MITCHELL: If the facts are as stated by my hon. friend and they are submitted to me, it does seem that what he has said would justify at least a preliminary investigation, and I shall be glad to take the matter into consideration.

Item agreed to.

105. *Labour Gazette* and other publications authorized by Labour Department Act, \$58,296.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: A paper comes to my box occasionally which is very cleverly written and very laudatory of the government, but so reactionary that I have tried to find out who are the sponsors. Has the department anything to do with that publication? It is called the *Labour Review*.

[Mr. MacNicol.]

Mr. MITCHELL: No. I will tell my hon. friend afterwards who publishes it. The hon. member for Vancouver East could tell him.

Mr. COLDWELL: It is anything but labour. Item agreed to.

103. Fair wages and conciliation, \$123,441.

Mr. GILLIS: Is there a fair wage officer in Nova Scotia?

Mr. MITCHELL: We have a very able conciliation officer at Fredericton, Mr. Pettigrove. He is there because it is the most strategic position between the two provinces. We have under consideration placing another man in that field.

Mr. GILLIS: For years Nova Scotia was the only province that did not have a fair wage officer.

Item agreed to.

106. Unemployment Insurance Act, 1940—administration, \$5,000,000.

Mr. MacINNIS: It has been drawn to my attention that insurance officers are disallowing claims for reasons that are not authorized under the act. The conditions under which insurance officers can disallow claims are restricted. They can disallow claims because contributions have not been paid in respect to the applicant; because the applicant's claim is not made in the prescribed manner, or on proof that he was unemployed on each day on which he claims to have been unemployed. There is one other condition—that he has not attended a training school. But it has been brought to my attention that these insurance officers disallow claims for reasons which are specifically excluded, that is, that the third statutory condition is not fulfilled, the condition that he is capable of work but unable to obtain suitable employment. This being new legislation I suggest that it is necessary that it should be so operated as to command the confidence of workers everywhere. If we start out in this wrong way we are going to create antagonism to the act which will cause difficulties later on.

Mr. MITCHELL: While these insurance officers have not the power to disallow a claim, what they do is to say to the claimant that they do not think he is entitled to benefit. But do not forget that the man always has the right to resort to the referees. They go a step further; they even say: This is the way you should argue your case when you go before the referee. That is my understanding. I discussed it quite recently with my officials.