

before a jury some time ago; I understand that the jury disagreed, and the cases are coming on for trial again next month. It is considered not to be in the public interest that the answers asked for should be made public at this time just before a jury trial. While there is no objection to the hon. member himself having that information, I do not think it should be made public property at this time.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I respectfully dissent from the whole attitude of the minister. What possible effect could the cost of these trials to the public have on an approaching jury trial?

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

FURNISHING OF INFORMATION TO MEMBERS PRIVATELY INSTEAD OF PUBLICLY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. K. FRASER (Peterborough West): I should like to ask the Minister of Finance a question based on a statement made by the Minister of National Revenue. On April 24, at page 2280 of *Hansard* I asked a question about subsidies. The Minister of Finance said that he did not think it was in the public interest to give the information and I then asked this question:

And after that, would there be any harm in showing me privately to whom these are paid?

The minister said:

I do not like the latter part of the suggestion.

I replied: "It has been done before." The minister said:

I really do not like it, because I do not think it is fair to other hon. members.

To-day the Minister of National Revenue suggested to the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) that he would show him the information privately. What is the difference between the two questions? Why should one hon. member receive the information privately and not another?

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): Each minister administers his own department and must take the responsibility for the practices he favours and adopts; and it is possible that my colleague and I have different views as to what should be done in the same situation. It is possible also that these are different situations.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): What are the rights of the members of parliament; that is what I should like to know?

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Then the Minister of Finance suggests what the Minister of National Revenue says is unfair.

[Mr. Gibson.]

LABOUR CONDITIONS

MACDONALD BROTHERS AIRCRAFT PLANT, WINNIPEG

On the orders of the day:

Mr. S. H. KNOWLES (Winnipeg North Centre): I should like to direct to the Minister of Munitions and Supply a question, notice of which I sent him earlier to-day. Has the minister received from the Winnipeg city council a copy of a resolution adopted at its meeting of last Monday evening, expressing concern over the large-scale lay-offs that have taken place recently at the MacDonald Brothers Aircraft plant, and asking the minister to investigate the possibilities of allotting to this plant contracts for other types of planes to replace the previous order allotted to this firm? If so, can the minister indicate what action may be expected in connection with this request from the Winnipeg city council?

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Munitions and Supply): I have not received the resolution of the city council but I have a letter from MacDonald Brothers Aircraft Limited referring to the matter, which I should read. It arrived on my desk to-day:

The Honourable C. D. Howe,
Minister,
Department of Munitions and Supply,
Ottawa, Ontario.

Dear Sir:

Enclosed herewith please find a clipping taken from the *Winnipeg Free Press* of May 23, 1944.

To-day we made a statement to our employees concerning this matter. A copy of this statement, and a letter to the Managing Editor of the paper is enclosed.

A similar report was published in the *Winnipeg Tribune* and we have sent a copy of our statement with a covering letter to the editor.

The following is the letter to the Managing Editor of the *Winnipeg Free Press* and the *Winnipeg Tribune*:

We wish to direct your attention to a press report of the last city council meeting. Statements were made that the airport division of this company would close down in June next due to lack of aircraft work. This statement is entirely wrong and we wish to bring to your attention the attached statement of fact which was given to our employees to-day.

We know that this statement will clear up any doubts in the minds of men and women who work for the company, and we are relying on the press to inform the public. We know that you appreciate the serious consequences which can ensue from the publication of misleading reports affecting the employment of large groups of men and women, particularly in war time, and would ask you to give the same prominence to this statement as to the original press report.

The following is the statement to the employees: