

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): There is \$175,000.

Mr. COLDWELL: I believe that is a smaller amount than was appropriated shortly after the last war, when there was an appropriation of \$200,000, if my memory serves me correctly.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): That was the maximum year.

Mr. COLDWELL: Yes; \$200,000 was the maximum. We should be spending the maximum now. May I say again that I thought it was most unfortunate that when Mr. Bennett was Prime Minister of this country the appropriation was so drastically cut, to the point where actually the stamping out of the disease was made exceedingly difficult. I am glad, therefore, to know that something is being done in this connection, and I can assure the minister that any appropriation he sets aside for purposes of this description will receive the hearty support of my colleagues and myself.

In the short time remaining to me I should like to offer some suggestions regarding the work of the committee. I am glad to know that the reference is broad enough that the committee may examine health schemes in other countries. There are two countries in which, I think, health has been placed in the forefront of the aims of the nation. No matter what we may think of the methods used to establish the present government in Russia; no matter what we may think of what is called communism—and I suppose there is no one in this chamber who dislikes communist party methods more than I do—yet I want to say this, that if there is one thing which has been done in Russia which we should study, and one thing that should be a challenge to all democratic nations, it is the manner in which Russia has dealt with health problems. That is the one great contribution, if they have made no others, that they have made to the welfare of the human race. The manner in which they care for mothers before children are born, for children after they are born, and the manner in which they use preventive medicine right through to life's end is something we should study. In Russia that is a service accessible and free to all.

The other country I have in mind is New Zealand. I realize that New Zealand has one advantage we have not at this time, namely, the ability to institute a nation-wide health scheme because it has a unitary parliament, or one parliament governing the whole country. That is not easily possible in a confederation such as ours. But I believe that if we approach the constitutional problem in the manner in

which it should be approached, and in the right spirit, we should be able to straighten out this constitutional difficulty. I believe that the basis of confederation, as written into the British North America Act, and upon which the unity of this country depends, is the recognition of certain rights, rights not only of minorities but of majorities as well. We often speak of the rights of minorities, but let us not forget that the majority also has rights. If we accept the point of view that both these rights are the fundamental basis of confederation, then it seems to me we can approach this matter in the spirit in which we ought to approach it.

I believe an attempt should be made to obtain from the several provinces an agreement with the dominion—call it a bill of rights, if you like—and into this agreement there should be written the basis of confederation. Remove the question of constitutional rights from the realm of partisan discussion, so that we may then agree as to what new powers are needed by the dominion in order to bring about the kind of social structure we desire. As I say, in that respect New Zealand has the advantage of being able to do what it wishes, because it is a unified country with a single parliament. But somehow or another we must devise ways and means of meeting this difficulty under which we labour. After all, national health and social security are not provincial problems. I often hear my hon. friends to my immediate left talking about the danger of interfering with the rights of local communities—in their case, provincial rights. Yet I often pay this tribute to Alberta: I do not know any province in Canada which in recent years has done more for its education system than has Alberta. How did they do it? Did they do it by recognizing the inherent rights of every little local school board, every little local community? Indeed, no. What they did was to adopt a larger unit of administration, and take from the local community in spite of considerable opposition, the right to control its own local schools. In that respect they found that the larger unit was more efficient; and I ask them to apply to the wider problems which confront this nation and indeed the world, the same logic as was applied by their government in relation to their local school districts.

There are certain problems which cannot be dealt with by municipalities, localities or provinces, but which must be dealt with by nations. By the same token there are certain problems, such as the elimination of war and the establishment of collective security for the world, which can be dealt with only by the cooperative effort of all the nations willing to cooperate.