

May I point out that the man, who, for instance, invests his money in the bonds of an industrial company is assured of an annual return at a very reasonable rate of interest. Suppose he invests \$15,000 in 7 per cent industrial bonds, he receives in return an annual income of \$1,050, which is more than the average wage earned by a man engaged in industrial pursuits in this country. Is it unreasonable to suggest that the man so engaged should be as well safeguarded in respect to the annual return on his labour as is the investor on his capital? If I could have my way, I would insist that the owners of industry should regard every employee as being at least as valuable to the industry as the man who invests \$15,000 in its bonds, and who, without any effort on his part, abstracts from the industry more than the man who is giving of his best to the industry directly and indirectly to the nation. An illustration in point comes to my mind in the town of Sudbury. At the present time according to the information I have received, thousands of men there are out of work. The main local industry is carried on by the International Nickel Company, a very wealthy corporation, which in past years has made enormous profits. Immediately there is a shrinkage in the demand for their output, and consequently a shrinkage in their profits, the management reduce the working staff and these men are thrown on the street indiscriminately, and no one seems to care what becomes of them. Those men have to walk the streets and have in some way to be maintained by the local authorities, while the profits of the industry which they have helped to build up go to others. During all their years of labour they have been in receipt of but a low wage, a wage which is not sufficient to enable them to save one cent for a rainy day. This condition of affairs in Sudbury is symptomatic of what is happening in many other industrial centres throughout the Dominion, and I submit that these industrial corporations ought to be compelled by law to do their share in looking after the men whom they have discharged, and whom they will have to look to as a reserve force when the present industrial depression ends.

Recently the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Bennett) in speaking to a delegation referred to evils of the dole in Great Britain. I took the precaution to look up his remarks in order to make sure that I might not misquote him. I think he certainly was unjust to the people of the old country. As a matter of fact those workers of Great Britain who are the beneficiaries under various

schemes of social insurance, are not in receipt of a dole; they are just as much entitled to what they receive as those who take out fire insurance and ultimately receive compensation in the event of their property being destroyed. The effects in Great Britain of the unemployment insurance scheme are not what I believe the Prime Minister had in mind when he spoke to the delegation that he received a couple of weeks ago. Would Great Britain to-day be better off if she did not have any unemployment insurance at all? It has been in operation for about 20 years, and we find that during that time crime has diminished so rapidly that to-day many of her prisons are empty and for sale. Contrast that with the condition prevailing in this country where we leave our unemployed to take care of themselves. Our statistics show an increase of crime, and this year we are going to enlarge our penal institutions to take care of those delinquents who probably if they had been assisted under a federal scheme of unemployment insurance would not to-day be inmates of such institutions.

I would remind the house that in addition to insurance against unemployment I have in mind also the question of provision against sickness and invalidity. In view of the salutary effect of such social legislation in Great Britain, I think we can make no mistake if we follow what has been in effect there for the past twenty years. I realize perhaps as well as any other member the constitutional difficulties which are inherent in a scheme of unemployment insurance. But just as we overcame the question of conflicting federal and provincial jurisdiction in dealing with the problem of old age pensions, so can we overcome it in adopting a system of social insurance. I think if this parliament would give a lead we could obtain the sympathetic cooperation of practically all the provinces, because unemployment is not a provincial, it is not a municipal, it is a federal problem. Unemployment is not due to what is being done municipally or provincially, it is largely the result of policies for which this parliament is more or less responsible. Consequently I am anxious that any scheme of unemployment insurance that we may institute should be federal in scope. To illustrate the difficulty of leaving this question to the provinces, let me take the city of Ottawa. Supposing there was unemployment insurance in force in the province of Quebec, but not in this province, and a man residing in Hull moved to the city of Ottawa, by so doing he would lose the advantage he enjoyed in Quebec