

*Prairie Farm Assistance*

ments were made in the months of July and August and probably early in September. In about sixty per cent there were some differences. A great deal of checking has been necessary in order to explain why a man put in a different return in 1939 about the 1939 acreage from that which he put in about the same acreage in 1941, or with regard to the 1940 acreage, as the case might be; and it has been in an attempt to justify payment on the basis of the 1941 declarations which were sworn to that there has been some delay. There were 186,000 farmers who made application, and 182,000 of them had been paid about \$27,000,000 down to the end of last week. Most of these have been paid their full amount, but at a recent date there were between 20,000 and 35,000 whose claims still had to be adjusted. Some of these adjustments are still being made. I think it will be agreed, however, that even if there are some 20,000 or 35,000 applications still outstanding, in which there is twenty-five per cent unpaid and with regard to which some adjustment must be made before payment, and some four or five thousand cases where no payment has been made at all, a real effort has been made by the organization, both in the treasury and in the Department of Agriculture, to get the payments out as soon as possible.

## LABOUR CONDITIONS

## AUTOMOBILE INDUSTRY—UNION RECOGNITION IN WINDSOR PLANT—REQUEST FOR CONCILIATION BOARD

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. W. NOSEWORTHY (York South): I wish to address some questions to the Minister of Labour. Over the week-end I was invited to attend a meeting of the automobile workers union at Windsor where they were discussing the question of union recognition in the Motor Products plant. I found a meeting of some 7,000 automobile workers protesting against the treatment which the workers of the Motor Products industry had received. My questions are: 1. What knowledge has the minister of this situation? 2. Why was the request for a conciliation board, made to the Department of Labour on December 6, not granted? 3. What does the Department of Labour propose for the settlement of that difficulty in order to avoid its spreading to other essential war industries in that section?

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): The strike took place while Mr. Louis Fine of Toronto, who acted as industrial disputes inquiry commissioner to look into the dispute, was at Windsor. It was illegal

[Mr. Gardiner.]

under the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act and under the orders in council establishing the industrial disputes inquiry commission. The employees were so informed. They indicated their willingness to return after the illegal strike. I sent a personal wire to the management suggesting that they be reinstated. The management replied that the employees in question had gone on an illegal strike and they found it was necessary to lay off some people, and they did not require their services at this time. Mr. Louis Fine is in Toronto to-day in connection with the matter in an effort to reach a satisfactory conclusion.

## REPORT OF TRANSFER OF ONTARIO HARD ROCK MINERS TO NOVA SCOTIA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. CLARENCE GILLIS (Cape Breton South): Following up the question raised yesterday with reference to the proposal to transfer men from Kirkland Lake to Nova Scotia, the minister yesterday stated that he had no knowledge of that situation but would make further inquiries. Has he any further information on the question now?

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): I had further inquiries made into the question raised by the hon. members for Cape Breton South and Inverness-Richmond. These inquiries have been made through the employment service of Canada, and it is reported by that service to me that no such transfer of miners has been suggested or arranged through the employment office. Judging from the inquiries made this morning, by the official of the department located at Kirkland Lake, the information is quite untrue. No such movement has been suggested by anyone. I hope that answers the question.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): By anyone?

Mr. MITCHELL: By anyone.

## SHIPPING

## REPORTED RESTRICTION IN DISPATCH TO ENGLAND OF CERTAIN MATERIALS AND FOODSTUFFS

Hon. GROTE STIRLING (Yale): I wish to ask a question but I do not know to which minister it should be addressed. In a London newspaper dated about four weeks ago there appeared a statement that owing to shipping losses parcels sent to Great Britain from overseas will be very greatly restricted and foodstuffs will not in future be permitted. I was astonished that I had seen no reference to such an order in the press of Canada and I have been unable to find out whether there is any truth in it at all or whether it is merely a canard.