

Canadian ship. Such unity of inspiration is the necessary foundation of our prosperity and our economic development.

On behalf of the youth of the country who envisage the future with dismay, on behalf of those who believe that all is not yet lost, and on behalf of those who have kept at the bottom of their soul a glimmer of hope, I ask the legislators of my country to make the final effort which will bring our beloved Canada to the fulfilment of its glorious destinies.

Mr. A. A. HEAPS (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have this opportunity of saying a few words in support of the motion before this house and at the same time speak to so many empty chairs. The reception accorded to this motion to-day is quite different from the reception given in 1927 to a motion of this kind introduced by myself. When I introduced a motion in 1927 to approve a policy of unemployment insurance, it received a rather hostile reception, and I am glad to note the great change that has come over this house in a period of twelve years. At this late hour it is not my intention to speak at any particular length; I wish to say just a few words in general support of the motion.

I am surprised to find an amendment moved at this late hour by the hon. member for Edmonton East (Mr. Kennedy), speaking on behalf of his group. I have a great deal of sympathy with the proposal to introduce a scheme of non-contributory unemployment insurance, but if the government is not prepared to accept such a scheme I am quite prepared to accept a contributory scheme of unemployment insurance. I believe that once we adopt the principle, as years go along we shall add to the measure, in exactly the same way as has been done in Great Britain. I was surprised at the emphatic rejection by my hon. friends to my left of the principles enunciated in the proposal of the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill).

I speak with a little knowledge and understanding of the labour movement in Canada. So far as I know, every labour organization in this country, whether represented by the international unions, the national unions, or the Catholic unions in the province of Quebec, has gone on record as being in favour of a contributory system of unemployment insurance. Now, lo and behold, we find a new spokesman for labour rising in his place and telling us that they do not want this system of contributory unemployment insurance.

Mr. MacNICOL: Who was that?

Mr. HEAPS: The hon. member for Edmonton East (Mr. Kennedy). Why do I say that if I cannot get one form of insurance I am prepared to accept the other? I do so because of my experience with the working people, among whom I have worked and with whom I have lived for so many years, both here, and, as a young man, in Great Britain. If there is one thing I would try to retain in this day it is the manhood and self-respect of the great mass of people now on relief. I know how difficult it is for the average worker who finds himself unemployed to go to a relief office and for the first time become the recipient of public relief. Sometimes it requires nerves of steel for a man to undertake such a task. I have known men to undergo the greatest hardships and to have their families suffer the utmost misery before they could force themselves to become the recipients of public relief. So I say that if we had a system of unemployment insurance under which the state, the employer and the employee would contribute, at least when a man became unemployed he would receive his cheque at the end of the week or the end of the month, and to a certain extent this would help him retain that manhood to which I think every man in Canada has a right.

Some statements were made this evening by the minister with respect to the system in the United States. After all, we must regard what is being done there under the Social Security Act as more or less of an experiment, but if my understanding of the situation in the United States is correct, this was about the only way by which they could circumvent the constitution. There they have a completely different problem from the one we have in Canada; for the simple reason that there they have forty-eight states with which to contend, whereas here we have only nine provinces. Sometimes we think nine are too many; and if some day events should move in such a direction that we could reduce the number of our provinces to five, I think it would be so much the better for this dominion. That experiment in the United States is something worth while, and I think out of their trials and experiences ultimately they will arrive at a much better method of dealing with unemployment insurance than they have at present. But there, in order to overcome the constitution, they took action, and that is the important thing. Whether the action is right or wrong we cannot say. I remember quite well thirteen years ago, when in this chamber we undertook to bring in a scheme