

that can be made does not change that question. The Liberal party—and I agree it is unfortunate that party language was used as it was with respect to that phase of the matter—said: We do not believe in giving money to people to spend that do not raise it by taxation.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I consider it is not a right principle.

Mr. BENNETT: As a question of interest it is good; as a question of principle it is bad. John P. Robinson said: Interest is good enough for me. But this is the real issue: you cannot to-night with all the power in the world scrap the provincial services and impose upon them a federal service without the loss of millions of dollars. That is as clear as anything can be. The difference between a national scheme and a provincial scheme at the present time is a very simple one; the hon. member for Vancouver Centre realizes that. The provinces have gone ahead and exercised their jurisdiction with respect to public health, hospitalization and so on; they have built in every part of the dominion plants of great value, have expended millions of dollars on them. How are you to impose on them a national scheme and leave them as they are? Are you to have two schemes or one? Are you to scrap one and maintain the other?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): Correlate them.

Mr. BENNETT: But this talk about correlation has been going on for a long time. The provinces have things in being as distinguished from things that are not in being, and as long as the provinces have an existing plan which is functioning they are not willing to surrender it to the federal power. That has been one of the great difficulties in our country. Referring to conferences, I have had the privilege of talking to representatives of all the provinces during the last four years. One province says, "No scheme that can be devised by the wit of man is as good as that which we have in this province for looking after the health of our people." The taxpayers have been paying for it, but now, because the taxpayers cannot provide as they did, they say; Give us some money. That however, is not the theory of a policy of national health or health insurance. It is not the basis of it; it is not the foundation of it. In this bill we have a national scheme of unemployment insurance; it is competent for us to attach to it a national scheme of health insurance qua those who are covered by it, and that is what these provisions are for.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is no national scheme.

Mr. BENNETT: It is a national scheme of unemployment insurance. Two million people out of a population of ten and a half millions may be affected by it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What is the outline of the scheme?

Mr. BENNETT: I see what the right hon. gentleman means. The scheme is not set forth here. This is to get the foundation upon which to lay a scheme, because the provinces have proceeded on the assumption that they are going to conduct this business in their own way. I have investigated the operations of every province in this confederation, and I know no single province that is prepared to say it is willing to forego its position. In British Columbia they have a statutory provision—

Mr. SPENCER: And in Alberta.

Mr. BENNETT: Well, in Alberta it is of a limited character, applying, I think only to districts. I may be wrong in that. In British Columbia the proposals were for the whole province; that at least is my understanding. Now we say we are going to introduce a scheme which will be an aid to the health of the people of this country. If on the basis of this measure we are able to make an appropriation to enable the commission to care for the health of those who are insured, we shall then have the commission that is so caring for them directly responsible to this parliament. But a national scheme that merely hands money over is one to which at the moment I cannot give my support. I said that last year and the year before when we were talking about the question of grants in aid. Grants in aid are the basis of the present old age pensions; in fact we are now paying three quarters of them. Grants in aid were established in this country in connection with highways, in connection with agriculture—

An hon. MEMBER: And technical education.

Mr. BENNETT: Yes, although technical education was on a somewhat different basis, because in our constitution there is concurrent jurisdiction respecting education. Having elaborated at great length the system that now exists, the provinces say: Let us deal with this—how? No suggestion of any way except the handing out of money. This bill contemplates something different—a scheme based upon exact information applied