

*Unemployment Insurance*

extremely dangerous and undesirable to adopt this amendment. I believe such a step would be resented by labour.

Mr. ROEBUCK: I of course would be one of the first to protest if I thought the right to strike or the advantage of labour was greatly interfered with in cases of strikes. I have always advocated the rights of labour, but here one comes up against difficulties which must be met in a practical way. When Mr. Tom Moore was before the committee he was asked a question with regard to these very clauses. No one ever questioned the loyalty of Mr. Tom Moore to the labour movement, or his common sense in dealing with matters affecting labour. As reported at page 116 of the proceedings of the committee he said:

The question of labour disputes, the people being involved; that is where labour is trying to be fair and saying that perhaps it would be asking too much to ask the employer to contribute to a fund that would finance our fight against him. In other words, the unemployment insurance benefit would not be used to strike against the employer.

A little further down on the page I made this comment:

My view of it is that while it is not entirely satisfactory, one might criticize it in detail, there is no other alternative scheme that is workable that we can substitute for what we have here with regard to labour disputes.

Mr. Moore replied:

We think it is a workable act, sir.

Of course I should like to put the labour forces into a position of advantage. It would be nice to say that in cases of strikes their unemployment insurance would continue, but it would not be common sense. It would array against this measure all the employer forces of the dominion. It would make the legislation unpopular, because it would involve it in these labour disputes, so much so that probably the measure would not remain on the statute books very long. As a matter of common sense and arrangement between these parties, I think we must leave this section as it is.

Mr. MacINNIS: This is one of the sections I spotted as soon as I began to give consideration to this bill. It came to my attention very quickly, of course, because of my long association with organized labour and labour disputes. Before the bill went to the committee I went over it as carefully as possible, in the time at my disposal after I received the bill, with representatives of organized labour and a legal gentleman who gave us legal interpretations as to the phraseology of the bill. We felt that organized labour was safeguarded as far as it was logical to attempt

[Mr. McLarty.]

to do so in this measure. However, I was not satisfied; that is, I did not wish to stop there, and when we were discussing this section in committee I brought up the matter once more. At page 173 of the proceedings of that committee I directed a question to the chairman which was answered by one of the young men now sitting in front of the minister. I put to him the hypothetical case of an insurable employee in one industry whose organization contributed to finance a strike in some other industry, and asked whether a member of such an organization would be barred from these benefits. I was assured that he would not. Mr. Hodgson read from a brief he had with him, part of which I should like to place on *Hansard*:

Mr. Hodgson: I think, sir, perhaps the best way to answer that issue is to read from a brief memorandum which we have on this specific point. It will take but a moment and I think it will show the principles that underlie the interpretation:—

Disqualification for participation in a labour dispute entails three preliminary conditions.

1. There must be a labour dispute.
2. The dispute must have occasioned a stoppage of work.
3. The claimant must have lost employment by reason of that stoppage, and the dispute must be at the premises where the claimant is employed.

I should like the committee to note particularly the next brief paragraph, because I think it contains the meat of the issue:

The fact that an employer without offering terms discharges a workman as not worth the standard rate, or not wishing to employ union members, discharges them without offering continued employment on any conditions, would not constitute a labour dispute.

It seems to me that is about as satisfactory as we can expect to get it with the imperfect social system under which we are operating. But there is another reason why I cannot support the amendment. If the hon. member had moved to delete paragraph (a), which disqualifies because of a strike, while it would not be very reasonable, at least it would be understandable. But the hon. member leaves that paragraph in and takes out what, in my opinion, are the real safeguards. Then at the bottom something else is left high and dry, entirely separate from the rest of the section. I do not know if that is intended to be left as it is or to continue from where the deletion commences. My humble opinion is that in respect of this matter the hon. member for North Battleford (Mrs. Nielsen) has been badly advised.

Mr. HANSELL: May I say a word respecting the amendment of the hon. member for North Battleford. I place myself in her position, and feel sympathetically disposed