

*Supply—Health and Welfare*

sight of the necessity and urgency for doing something about blind pensions. The minister has mentioned this, and I know she has some problems in working out a solution in conjunction with the provinces. However, I believe she has enough drive to bring it to a head and do something more for the benefit of blind people, as has been already done on old age security.

I also want to speak for a few minutes on the question of disability pensions. For far too long the definition of a disabled person has been much too strict. Actually this philosophy of a disabled person having to be in a wheelchair or lying in bed is ridiculous in this day and age. It should be related to his ability to have or to get any type of employment.

In this connection there is another point which we encounter in practice over and over again. Quite often a disabled person is a married man, and his wife goes out to work because the disability allowance is quite insufficient to keep the household. However, once she earns more than \$1,980 a year, or \$165 a month, she is in trouble. That is ridiculous, because quite often she has to pay carfare or drive a motorcar to get to her place of work. She has to buy food, clothes, pay for rent and fuel, and look after the furnishings in the house. It is ridiculous for officials to penalize people simply because they are showing thrift.

When I was home last week end a case was drawn to my attention of a mother who had two children going to high school. These two were over 16 years of age, and she had a third child coming into that age bracket. Through you, Mr. Chairman, I say to the minister of health that the promise of the Liberal party to continue family allowances as long as children are at school should be implemented at once. I think there is general agreement that they said they would extend it to the age of 18 years, and as a matter of fact the Minister of Justice stated in the house that the government had a plan, which he thought was a pretty thorough going one, and that it would be introduced in due course.

There is a little urgency about this in view of the fact that the cost of living has increased. It should be remembered that boys and girls are being kept longer at school not only upon the insistence of the parents and the department of education which exhorts the parents to keep them there, but also on the advice of the federal government which says the young people should continue at school to learn the necessary skills so that they will not be unemployed. Surely we cannot have it both ways.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to dwell for a little while on the question of the conference

[Mr. Rynard.]

that is being held here next Monday. I know and appreciate that the Minister of National Health and Welfare has taken a very sympathetic attitude toward this matter, but I wonder whether she or the ordinary person realizes the great importance of this conference. I recall that when I went to medical school 35 years ago, cancer of the lung did not have to be considered at all and was not looked for. We were looking for tuberculosis and other things on the X-ray plates. When a radiologist looks at an X-ray plate today, he looks at it very carefully to see if there is any evidence of cancer. From 1899 to 1919, if my memory is correct about these years, in the University of Minnesota they reported only three cases of cancer of the lung. In the year 1919, at that same university hospital, they reported only one case. In the years 1949 to 1952 they reported over 264 cases. We must bear in mind in this connection, Mr. Chairman, that generally speaking very few cigarettes were smoked prior to the first great war. Since that war there has been a gradual step-up year by year in the number of cases of lung cancer which have occurred in the United States. The increase in the number of cases of cancer of the lung has been paralleled by the increase in the consumption of cigarettes, and in the year 1960 there were 37,000 people who died of cancer of the lung in the United States.

It is true that in proportion to men, not many women have died of cancer of the lung, but I hope this does not start the minister back on the road to destruction, because there has been a marked increase over the years in the number of women who have developed this disease. To demonstrate the seriousness of this situation I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that out of every 100 of these cases of lung cancer that are diagnosed, within five years 95 of them are dead, regardless of the type of treatment carried out. Therefore it follows that there is only one form of treatment, and that is prevention. When we look at the record and all the surveys that have been made, we realize that to all intents and purposes those who do not smoke do not contract cancer of the lung. I want to go a little further, Mr. Chairman, and say that we can consider a religious group, the Seventh Day Adventists, who do not smoke or drink, and we find that to all intents and purposes they never contract the disease of cancer of the lung.

I have illustrated that there is no cure for this disease, and in Canada today more people are dying of cancer of the lung—and this is leaving out coronary diseases and all the other things; and there are about double the number of deaths in the coronary field—from