to myself, but I cannot find in the resolution anything pertaining to the operation of machines, to how much they will produce, to the purchasing power of the people or to many of the other matters mentioned by him. I will try to confine my remarks to the resolution.

An hon. MEMBER: That will be a novelty.

Mr. MacNICOL: It would be a greater novelty if my hon. friend knew at any time anything about what he was speaking. Any sound economic bill which may be founded upon the report of this committee on social security and which is returned to this house through the government to carry out the objectives of the resolution will have my unstinted support. Like the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) for as long as I have known him, ever since I have been in the house I have been a persistent advocate of national health insurance. Others in the house have likewise been persistent advocates of it. The late leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation, the present hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. MacInnis) and others I have known have never let an opportunity pass to advocate national health insurance. The hon. member for Waterloo South (Mr. Homuth), both while he was in the Ontario legislature and out of the Ontario legislature, has always been a persistent advocate of national health insurance. I intend to confine my remarks to a portion of the words of the resolution. It states:

. . . the most practicable measures of social insurance for Canada—

I suppose that means beneficial changes in the Unemployment Insurance Act. I continue to quote:

—including health insurance and the steps which will be required to effect their inclusion in a national plan.

The Prime Minister must feel a good deal of satisfaction at seeing crystallized even in resolution form his own advocacy of national health insurance. But I would much rather have seen the Prime Minister sponsor a bill at this session because I am persuaded that he knows all about the subject. He has studied it long enough, knows what should be done, and is just as familiar as I am with similar acts in all those countries in which national health insurance is in operation. While I endorse this resolution I would much sooner be rising to support a bill introduced by the Prime Minister, who for so long has been a persistent advocate of this boon. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I am wondering why we have not a bill before us. When this matter came up during the administration of the Right Hon. Mr. Bennett, or before when there was talk about it, I made a trip to Europe and made as thorough a survey as I could of the health insurance acts in operation in Belgium, Holland, Germany, and particularly in Great Britain. The British act is, in my judgment, by far the best, and I am not saying that in disparagement of the legislation of any other country. That the British act is by far the best is only to be expected because it has been in operation ever since 1911, together with several amendments made in the intervening years. When I first heard of the government's proposal I hoped that the government would bring down a bill this session, and I can assure them that any bill that is comparable with the British act will have my support. The British legislation might not be adapted to all our conditions in Canada. Great Britain is in the happy position of having only one government which legislates for all its people. Here we are handicapped—perhaps I should not say handicapped; maybe I should say benefited—in that we have nine provincial governments and one federal government. But I have confidence that the Prime Minister could overcome that handicap just as he overcame it in the matter of unemployment insurance, and I still hope that at the earliest possible moment he will bring in a bill for national health insurance—and perhaps much earlier than any of us expect.

As I said, I made a trip to Europe to make my own observations of the operation of national health insurance. Germany had long had such legislation, their first legislation on the subject being enacted in 1883. Great Britain did not enact its legislation until 1911, but the British bill has accomplished infinitely more than the German bill. On the other hand, the British government had the great advantage of all the experience which the great labour unions of Great Britain had had. Those labour unions were the pioneers in this whole matter of health insurance or, as they called it, sick benefits. The experience of those great unions dated back to 1831, and when the British government took over the operation of national health insurance they founded their legislation very largely upon the operation of the splendid regulations which the great labour unions of Great Britain had found satisfactory in operation over a long period of years. I am a staunch supporter of the British act. It was my pleasure to visit many of the labour offices in Great Britain and to observe the administration of the act. I visited the labour offices in London, Manchester, Leeds, Sheffield, Birmingham, Glasgow, Edinburgh and Belfast. It was a pleasure