

having it immediately function. That cannot be done. The machinery to be set up is quite complicated and to put it in operation will take some time.

The second representation urged against the bill was that sufficient time had not been given for its consideration.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Hear, hear. That is right.

Mr. McLARTY: My hon. friend says "hear, hear." I will endeavour to indicate to him the consideration which the bill has received.

As he knows, agitation for unemployment insurance has been a live issue for twenty-one years. As he knows, in 1935 a committee was appointed to consider a bill which, while it contained some differences, was generally the same in principle as this one, save principally for the graded rule. He knows too that in 1935, when our bill was passed, we did not have the advantage of the consolidated British bill which was passed after the act of 1935. We did not have the advantage of the United States security act and its operation in fifty-one states and federal districts of that country. But since then this matter has been studied. It is not as if, the resolution addressed to the imperial parliament, having passed on the 25th of June, next day the resolution was put on the order paper, and the bill was not produced in the meantime. It is the product of intensive study for the last five years.

In the first place, my predecessor in office asked to come from Geneva Mr. D. Christie Tait, recognized as one of the world's best informed experts both on the legislative and administrative aspects of unemployment insurance; and he spent considerable time revising it. In addition there has been continuously in the Department of Labour a committee which is studying it, comparing it, compiling data which is available from all possible sources, including many other countries. I venture to say that no bill which has ever been presented to the parliament of Canada has had more full and complete consideration than the bill which is now before this committee.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That may be true of the department, but certainly it is not true of this parliament. After all, we are making the law.

Mr. McLARTY: May I point out to my hon. friend that we are here to-day to study it in committee. We can give it all the consideration we wish, right here. That is what we are here for.

There was a third representation made, by those who felt that while the measure was a

good one, they had been so careful in looking after their employees that it was not necessary that they should be included under the bill. These were largely financial institutions. May I say that these institutions painted an impressive picture of the provision they have made to look after their employees when unemployed, and also in the matter of a retirement fund. It is possible that their employees may not benefit as much as employees of other industries under the proposed bill. But if you remove from this bill what may be called the sheltered employments, and cover only those in which the unemployment record and experience are weak, what becomes of your insurance principle? Surely the broader the basis of the act the better and more actuarially sound it must inevitably become. Undoubtedly some institutions treat their employees with preferred care, but I suggest that if institutions and industries which look after their employees properly, guaranteeing them against any loss of time or of money due to unemployment, were withdrawn from the act, you would destroy its actuarial basis.

In addition, the fundamental purpose of this bill as I see it is to promote the economic and social security of our people. If that be the case, is it asking too much of our financial institutions and good employers that they shall spend at least a fraction of their revenues in promoting that economic and social security of the country?

A fourth point was raised in committee, namely that some of those in the excepted employments should be brought under the terms of the act. Perhaps it will be suggested that certain employments of this class should properly be included in the benefits of the bill, but I would ask that in considering the matter the committee remember three or four principles upon which the bill is established.

In the first place it is only fair to remind hon. members that this is an unemployment insurance act. It is not a health insurance act. It pays no benefits for sickness.

In the second place it is not an unemployed aid or assistance act. In other words it does not pretend to cover by any means the field of unemployment. As hon. members are aware, both the national employment commission and the dominion-provincial relations commission have recommended that to supplement the national unemployment insurance bill there should be passed what was called by one a national assistance bill and by the other a national aid bill. But that is subject to certain definite negotiations and arrangements whereby the responsibilities and duties as between the provinces and the dominion are properly allocated; and it is deemed unwise to hold up this bill, which, if it is