I notice that the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Heaps) seemed to think that we in Alberta, and of this group, were against any help to the working man, simply because we see that in helping him in this way we would probably make his condition worse than it now is. I think my colleague the hon. member for Edmonton East (Mr. Kennedy) made a good point when he mentioned the power that would be conferred on the state by such a scheme as this, because a man who has paid for unemployment insurance for a number of years would hesitate to do anything which might endanger his benefits. He would think twice before he agitated or struck for better conditions. That would be giving the state a great power over the working man. Already power is much too concentrated. That is a danger not only in Europe where, with the exception of two countries, and they not seeming very anxious to get away from it, dictatorship is a fact; but it is on its way here, and therefore we in this group are against anything that tends to concentrate power either in the dominion government or in this house. We think the power is too much centralized now.

Mr. LAWSON: How would going on strike interfere with a man's benefits under unemployment insurance?

Mr. JAQUES: I am afraid that under the system the insured would give a hostage to those who control the system. They could be told, "All right, strike, but you lose your unemployment benefits."

Mr. LAWSON: How could he be told that? The statute has its provisions. Any unemployment insurance act would contain provisions as to the conditions under which a man drew benefits, and any reasonable act would have in it the provision that there would be a hiatus or something for the period of a strike.

Mr. JAQUES: I am not saying that it would, but I say it could and probably would. For these reasons I cannot subscribe to the resolution.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

END OF VOLUME I