

ment that steps be taken to see that this work becomes readily available to members of the House of Commons and to the public generally.

If there be any who fear the introduction of social security measures, may I for a moment refer them to the three guiding principles outlined by Sir William Beveridge. In clause 7, at page 6 of his report, we find this:

The first principle is that any proposals for the future, while they should use to the full the experience gathered in the past, should not be restricted by consideration of sectional interests established in the obtaining of that experience. Now, when the war is abolishing landmarks of every kind, is the opportunity for using experience in a clear field. A revolutionary moment in the world's history is a time for revolutions, not for patching.

The second principle is that organization of social insurance should be treated as one part only of a comprehensive policy of social progress. Social insurance fully developed may provide income security; it is an attack upon want. But want is one only of five giants on the road of reconstruction and in some ways the easiest to attack. The others are disease, ignorance, squalor and idleness.

The third principle is that social security must be achieved by cooperation between the state and the individual. The state should offer security for service and contribution. The state in organizing security should not stifle incentive, opportunity, responsibility; in establishing a national minimum, it should leave room and encouragement for voluntary action by each individual to provide more than that minimum for himself and his family.

There are two cogent reasons why Canada must follow the lead given to us by Great Britain. The first is contained in the Atlantic charter, in which Canada fully concurred. It reads:

To bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field with the object of securing for all improved labour standards, economic advancement and social security.

The second is stated by Sir William Beveridge, as follows:

There will, it may be hoped, come a season when it is profitable to consider the practical relations of social insurance in Britain and of schemes for the same purpose in the dominions, in the colonies and in other countries of the world. On the assumption that once again it will be possible for men to move from one country to another to find the best use for their powers, it will be desirable to consider the making of reciprocal arrangements between the schemes of different countries facilitating transfer from one to the other, that is to say arrangements enabling men on migration to avoid forfeiting security and allowing them to carry with them some of the rights that they have acquired in their former country. That should, in due course, become a practical problem. It is not possible to-day to do more than mention the problem to show that it has not been forgotten.

The matter of immigration following the war has been mentioned by hon. members who spoke earlier in the debate. I shall make only one comment respecting that matter. Canada must first stabilize her domestic economy for her own people, and especially for her own returned men and women, whose sacrifices must never be forgotten, before she embarks upon any general policy of immigration from Europe. Conditions after the war will not be the same as they were before 1939, and it must not be overlooked that even to-day Great Britain is producing well over fifty per cent of her food requirements.

I commend the government for the steps taken, and particularly do I commend the Minister of Pensions and National Health (Mr. Mackenzie), whose activities in this regard have at last borne fruit. I trust that in any legislation that is brought down the guiding principle will be that enunciated by Sir William Beveridge, namely, a national minimum about which prosperity can grow, but with want abolished. We are taking the positive rather than the negative side. I believe it is well to emphasize the positive side. On the positive side we are putting work and useful employment ahead of the other measures. There may be opposition to the measures proposed, not perhaps from inside the house but by interests outside. There always has been opposition when measures have been introduced looking to the betterment of the lot of the common people. There may also be the cry, "Where will the money come from?" We have heard that cry many times in this house, especially up to 1939. It must not be forgotten that in no year until 1939 did Canada spend more than \$500,000,000 by way of total expenditures, but this year our expenditures will amount to something like \$4,000,000,000, just eight times as much. I think that should answer any cry of, "Where will the money come from?"

Travelling eastward for the session I was gratified to hear that the medical profession from one end of the country to the other were one hundred per cent behind the health insurance proposals and had been most helpful in drafting them. This is a splendid beginning and augurs well for the success of the scheme. I am hoping that the special committee which is to be set up will get to work as speedily as possible and that definite action will be taken during the present session. If this is done, the hopes of thousands of our people may be realized, especially the war widows and other widows, and also the aged. Large numbers of these people have almost given up any hope of a better world this side of the resurrection.