

(1918), Czechoslovakia (1919), Portugal (1919), Poland (1920), Japan (1922), Greece (1922), Chile (1924), Lithuania (1925) and France (1928). In Australia and South Africa commissions have been appointed to study the question and a bill providing for a system of social insurance is now before the Australian parliament. In Brazil a labour code which will contain provisions for sickness insurance is in course of preparation. In Italy a system of compulsory insurance against tuberculosis is announced as the beginning of a general scheme of sickness insurance.

This information that I give is now old; it goes back to 1928. I do not know what other countries have been doing in the last seven years; at least I have not the information at hand—I happened to have this in my file with my other papers—but all this was done over seven years ago. We in Canada during the past seven years have not moved one inch towards realizing anything of this kind, and now we are being put off by a section in the present employment insurance bill that asks a committee to study the question and secure information. It is not study that we need at the present time; it is action.

Mr. DONNELLY: In the countries my hon. friend has referred to as having sickness insurance, has any of them sickness insurance connected with unemployment insurance, or are the two subjects dealt with separately?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: In a number of countries they are closely connected.

Mr. DONNELLY: They are?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Yes.

Mr. DONNELLY: Is any of those countries of the opinion that unemployment insurance and sickness insurance are better kept separate instead of being treated in one and the same measure?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I cannot give that information. In Great Britain the two subjects are closely connected.

Mr. DONNELLY: Yes, and very unsatisfactorily.

Mr. HEAPS: Who says so?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Some doctors do not like the situation in Great Britain, I know, but a great many of the workers find that it is more satisfactory than what we have in Canada.

There is one other thing. I cannot quite see why the Prime Minister should insist that parliament has jurisdiction in the matter of unemployment and not in the matter of public health. To a large extent he based his plea for unemployment insurance on the treaty of

Versailles. In this same document of our own Department of Labour, from which I have already quoted, I find this note:

The League of Nations international labour organization, at its tenth session held at Geneva in May-June, 1927, adopted two draft conventions and one resolution on the subject of sickness insurance. The first draft convention related to sickness insurance for workers in industry and commerce, and domestic servants; the second draft convention dealt with sickness insurance for agricultural workers; and the recommendation laid down general principles of sickness insurance.

If this government feels called upon to provide unemployment insurance as implementing the treaty of Versailles and to enact it under peace, order and good government, I cannot for the life of me see why it should not provide sickness insurance as well. It seems to me that while we squabble in this house year after year after year—

An hon. MEMBER: Speak for yourself.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Somebody says, "Speak for yourself." Does he refer to me? I am speaking for myself and I believe for tens of thousands of people throughout this country who are looking to parliament to do something to relieve their distress. When representatives of the blind appeared this morning before the committee on industrial and international relations I was delighted that hon. members from all sections of this house lent a sympathetic ear to the presentation of their case. I know perfectly well that all of us in this house would like to see the blind cared for, and I know that all in this house would like to see the sick more adequately cared for. I do urge that this should not be made a mere party game.

An hon. MEMBER: It is not.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Then if it is not a party game there must surely be some way in which we can get together to provide for the urgent needs of the people. These constitutional questions can be relegated to the background. The hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) laughs. I do not mean that there is no constitutional question to be dealt with, but I urge that such questions are subordinate to the urgent needs of the people.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Why should the hon. gentleman ask that the British North America Act be amended if this can be done in the way he suggests?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: We need amendments to the act because of changed conditions; but the present situation is suffi-