

have placed our people in an impossible position. I know the minister is anxious to do all that can be done; and just to strengthen his hand—because I believe it needs strengthening when he has to deal with some of the other members of the cabinet—I am going to point out that in the United States this year, under the LaFollette-Bulwinkle bill, the federal treasury of the United States is granting \$6,500,000 to the states for one item alone. I am not going to mention what that item is, but this amount is being granted in addition to what the states themselves can collect. If Canada should grant as much money, in proportion to population, this year her contribution to our provinces would amount to \$650,000—it is at present just nothing. Let hon. members just take a glance at the very modest sum the minister is permitted to spend, and they will recognize that he is handicapped almost to the point of impotence. Surely conditions in Canada are no better than they are in the United States. If the United States needs such a large amount of money, then surely Canada needs at least a proportionate sum.

I should like to revert for a moment or two to the family of five receiving \$40 a month, with an unavoidable expenditure of \$50. Is it to be an accepted fact by governing people in Canada that such a family can have no amusement at all, that they cannot have twenty cents to go to a picture show once in a while? Are they to have no culture such as singing lessons, music or dancing lessons? Hon. members will see what we are condemning them to.

Having done that I turn my attention to an article which the minister kindly sent to me. A few moments ago I pointed out that Canada is lagging shamefully in the matter of social legislation. I shall give only the headings in this pamphlet, and I believe they will show Canada's deficiency when compared with her small sister dominion of

New Zealand. The title of the article is "Social security in New Zealand", and the subheadings are "Universal superannuation"—have we that in Canada? Of course we have not. "Age benefits"—have we age benefits? "Widows' benefits, orphans' benefits, family benefits, invalids' benefits, miners' benefits, unemployment benefits, sickness benefits, emergency benefits." I wish I had time to deal in detail with each of those points, but any hon. member who is interested may find the information at page 200 of this little booklet called "The National Health Review," published in October of 1940, by direction of the minister.

May I close what I have said in more or less rambling fashion with an adjuration to the minister to exert himself to the very maximum to get more and more money in this dominion to be spent for the improvement of health conditions of the people of Canada, in widely varied ways. If he will do that he will greatly increase the productive capacity of the country; he will increase its consumptive capacity. He will make the country very much happier, so that it will be much easier to get men to enlist in the army. Those men will fight much more happily when they realize that while they are in the army their people are being cared for at home, and that they will be cared for if anything should happen. In addition to that, when we collide with the enemy we will be strong and confident.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): I thank the hon. member for his very constructive suggestions.

Yesterday the hon. member for Cape Breton South discussed the question of silicosis, and the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggart asked a question respecting fatal accidents in the mining industry. With the consent of the house I should like to place on *Hansard* the information on both these subjects. It is as follows:

Fatal Industrial Accidents in Mining Industry  
Canada

Due to	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940
(a) Industrial diseases (predominate—namely, silicosis).....	8	14	15	22	29
(b) Dangerous substances (exclusive of silicosis and includes explosions and gassing).....	25	29	36	25	21
(c) Grand total.....	173	198	236	161	160