

The right hon. gentleman went on to warn us about taxes. I quite appreciate his problem in having to raise the taxes necessary and I know this would be a heavy burden, but at the same time we are told that Canada is fairly prosperous, that the banks have not been doing so badly and that certain enterprises are getting along fairly well. We are told also that there is a good deal of money available for investment, and in reply we simply say this: If it is a choice between the needs of the people and the interests of the big investors of this country, the needs of the people should come first. I think we must adopt that attitude when we consider a proposal of this character.

Mr. YOUNG: In view of the fact that the farmer will have to pay most of this insurance, how does the hon. member propose to compensate the farmer for the additional burden which he proposes to place on his back?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I do not accept the statement that the farmer would have to pay most of it; I do not think that is true.

Mr. YOUNG: A large portion of it.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I might remark that the farmer does not pay any income tax, so that he need not be worried a great deal. I think the scheme might be worked out as a charge on the incomes of these people who are most able to pay.

Mr. LAVERGNE: Who will pay the premium for the insurance and who will be the insurer? Is the state going to be the insurer and will the workmen pay the premiums?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: As the hon. member knows very well, we are not going into the details of this scheme to-day. If there is any interest in that particular matter, I might say that the scheme which most of us have had more or less in view is the British scheme. Possibly I might take a few minutes to outline just what that scheme means.

Persons between the ages of 16 and 65 must take out unemployment insurance. There are a number of classes excepted, among which are farm labourers and domestic servants, who can take out insurance if they so desire. The insurable persons are divided into various classes, as follows:

Men between the ages of 21 and 65 pay, in Canadian money, 14 cents per week; the employers pay 16 cents per week and the state pays 15 cents per week.

Men between the ages of 18 and 21 years pay 12 cents per week, the employer 14 cents and the state 13 cents.

Boys under the age of 18 years pay 7 cents per week; the employers 8 cents and the state 7 cents.

Women between the ages of 21 and 65 years pay 12 cents per week, the employer 14 cents and the state 13 cents, and so on with various other groups.

Mr. LAVERGNE: It is state insurance.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: The British scheme further provides that whenever the insured person is unemployed he draws a weekly rate of benefits as follows:

Men between the ages of 21 and 65 years, \$4.25 per week; women between 21 and 65 years of age, \$4.25 per week, and so on with different classes. In addition to this, any insured person who has an adult dependent draws \$2.25 per week. Married people receive an additional benefit of 50 cents per week for each wholly dependent child, or one who is mainly supported by the parents. Under the British scheme, in order to come within the period of insurance, the insured person must have paid in not less than 30 weeks' contributions in the two years immediately preceding the date on which he or she applies for the benefits.

We have not gone into these details here because we shall have to work out our scheme in Canada along our own lines. Further, I may as well say frankly that, so far as I can see, it would be impossible immediately to set up a contributory scheme because a large number of unemployed are absolutely unable to pay anything at the present time, and that would make it impossible for a reserve to be built up. That is one reason for our not suggesting an immediately contributory scheme.

Mr. LAVERGNE: It applies as well to a lawyer who has no cases, or to a doctor who has no patients.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: The lawyer makes so much money while he is in practice that he has a sufficient reserve laid up. The average wage of our labouring classes is very low.

There is another aspect of this question which I think should perhaps be mentioned in this connection. The Prime Minister has almost entirely overlooked the seriousness of the actual problems that confront the workers to-day. According to his statement, they will have to wait probably four years before this government can do anything for them, except