

126601

- 2 -

Opposition if they did not actually win a majority of seats.

We should face the fact at once that it is going to be impossible to maintain in Canada a contributory plan of Unemployment Insurance in the face of no employee contributions in the United States. We are only deluding ourselves if we think it can be done. But a non-contributory system with the persistent radical drive for extension of benefits, for the inclusion of farmers and eventually the unemployed, would be a terrific threat to the solvency of the National Treasury. The social and political possibilities are not pleasant to contemplate but with the world-wide drift toward totalitarian methods why deny the possibilities?

There are only two doors of escape from this sequence of events:

One is to take hold of the undoubted workers' preference for individual savings accounts and build an Unemployment Insurance scheme on that with assistance from employers and in special cases with government assistance, where the causes of unemployment may properly be considered a national responsibility. (The savings made to the National Treasury by the elimination of government contributions for 75% of workers who would undoubtedly adopt the assisted Savings Plan, with the additional saving of administration expense, would go a long way towards supplying the larger benefits necessary in industries or vocations where the Savings Plans were inadequate to meet those special conditions.

The other alternative is to give the Bill an indefinite hoist on the ground that public opinion is decidedly opposed (as it is) to giving this matter at this time the attention which such a vitally important piece of legislation requires. It could then be brought up in the next Parliament or left to a later date and in the interim the employers of Canada and their employees would have an opportunity to submit a law for consideration,-- the same opportunity that was accorded to the labour leaders who according to the representations of Mr. Heaps and the testimony of Mr. Tom Moore before the House Committee had the special privilege of framing or helping to frame the Act now under consideration.

Every newspaper in Canada would approve a hoist of this kind.

MEIGHEN PAPERS, Series 5 (M.G. 26, I, Volume 199)

PUBLIC ARCHIVES
ARCHIVES PUBLIQUES
CANADA