

to the unemployed or increasing the amount of benefit they should be given for their contributions. In fact, he said in his remarks that we should have done that, that there should be more in the way of reward so that those who are contributing to an insurance scheme will get something more in the way of benefit out of their contributions, if not in one direction at least in another, so that they will get back whatever in the way of contributions they may have made. I think he also would have said that we should have reduced the age limit for old age pensioners, that that was more important than what we were proposing to do, and that we should have done a little more for those who were paralysed, for permanent invalids, and others. There would have been criticism of the government all along the line for everything that had not been included. It is advisable that the committee should realize how vast is the scope of social insurance measures and how many measures have to be considered when a government, whether it be provincial or dominion, undertakes to add another piece of social legislation to what already exists.

What has been brought out very clearly in this discussion is the fact that there has grown up in Canada, without relation one to the other, a large number of social security measures, and that as a consequence of there having been no general plan to which the different parts should relate, there is to-day a great amount of overlapping as between the dominion and the provinces with respect to these security measures, with the consequence there is much more inefficiency in administration and great waste. The necessity of linking together, however it may be done, the measures that relate to security in this country must surely be seen to be one of the imperative needs at the present time. The fact that we have already so much social legislation—and it is evident that we are going to have more—makes it clear that at this time we should seek to have a plan that from now on can be followed by the provinces and the dominion alike. That is a great undertaking I think for members of parliament. It is a work that can be accomplished by members of parliament, and a work which will be in the nature of a national service of the highest kind.

I was impressed by what the hon. member who spoke on health a little earlier in the afternoon said, that we have now health departments in all the different provinces and a dominion health department as well. Surely the time has come when if we are going to add further legislation which relates to health, in the nature of insurance legislation against

sickness and ill-health in its different forms, some survey ought to be made to see whether we are to have the provinces and the dominion handle health matters separately and independently or whether some arrangement cannot be arrived at whereby there will not be a duplication of functions on the part of all.

I do not think that a national plan implies that the government would in any way seek to have everything centralized at Ottawa, any more than I think that a national plan would necessitate having identical legislation in the different provinces and all the provinces operating together in accordance with a uniform plan. But I do think it means the careful study of how social security measures can best be effected through cooperation between the provinces and the dominion, and that in relation to all other social security measures. That I believe can be worked out by a committee in a manner which will make a contribution not only to the work of this parliament but to that of the provincial legislatures as well.

I had not thought of saying anything in particular about political aspects of the discussion which has taken place. I was careful in my introductory remarks not to make any reference to the sources of inspiration of passages in the speech from the throne. But my hon. friend the leader of the opposition found it impossible not to make a reference to the Winnipeg convention, and the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker) felt it important to draw attention to what was set forth in the platform of the National Liberal convention which was held in this city as long ago as 1919. He sought, I think, to create the impression that the Liberal party which was responsible for the platform of 1919 was taking a long time to implement its policies. I must thank hon. gentlemen opposite for giving me a reasonable excuse for quoting just one plank from the platform of the National Liberal convention and indicating to hon. members what, as a matter of fact, has been accomplished in the carrying out of a programme of social security. I hope this will dispose of the idea that what is suggested in the speech from the throne owes its origin to the Beveridge report or to the Progressive-Conservative Winnipeg convention, or to the Canadian Commonwealth Federation conference at Regina, or to anything other than continuing the policy laid down at the Liberal convention which was held in this city in 1919.

Mr. GRAYDON: I thought my right hon. friend said that it originated in "Industry and Humanity."