

paragraph from the December Health Bulletin of the city of Toronto:

In discussing the minimum income the medical health officer said: "In determining this, we must do so, not only in the interest of the family, but also of the state, inasmuch as the essentials for proper nutrition and proper methods of living mean the difference oftentimes between a physical asset and a physical liability to the nation. The minimum standard of living must be such as to make it possible for every child to be well born and have an adequate opportunity for normal development, and the maintaining of physical fitness for every adult. A fitness that will enable men to give 100 per cent efficiency to their employers and the mothers to give 100 per cent efficiency in their homes. A standard should be fixed below which no family can safely come."

While these are only a few investigations that have been made in connection with children, and only a limited number of the figures and facts available, yet they seem to prove beyond doubt that not only is poverty largely responsible for malnutrition, but they are oftentimes in direct ratio.

In an investigation made by the Bureau of Child Hygiene and Child Welfare at Washington, they found that the mortality among the lowest-paid ranged from 2 to 3 times greater than among those with the largest incomes.

Now, in the face of such a situation as that, in face of the poverty that prevails in so many of our cities, I can hardly understand the callousness of some of our financiers as they look over the situation that prevails. For instance, in the annual statement of the Bank of Montreal—and I believe there are directors of that institution members of this House—the general manager states that unemployment is a natural corrective. As I think of these cases brought to our notice by the Victorian Order of Nurses and by social workers in all our cities from coast to coast, I can hardly conceive of any man or any group of men really understanding the situation and declaring that unemployment is a natural corrective. I claim that we have come to a period in the history of our country when we must decide once and for all which shall prevail, profits or human welfare. I feel confident that there is a group of men here, new members of the House if you will, who have clearly made up their minds that, in so far as they can decide it, human welfare is to be given the precedence.

I should like to suggest certain points which gradually emerge as the unemployed themselves have discussed this great problem of theirs. First of all, it seems to me that it should be recognized that, under the present system of large-scale industry, unemployment is involuntary. I am quite free to admit that there are among the

unemployed a certain percentage who are lazy, drunken and inefficient—and any one who has studied the subject knows that, to a very large extent, their laziness, drunkenness and inefficiency are the result of our haphazard system—but at the same time we must further admit that that percentage is a very small one indeed. A few months ago most of these men who are now unemployed were at work, and if work offered they would be at work again. The difficulty with a good many of us in this country is that we have only recently passed through the pioneer development of our country. Some of us have grown up on the farm. Others of us who have not directly grown up on the farm still have more or less of the farm background and the farm traditions. We think back to the day when if a man could not find work and could not make a success it was his own fault. It was a time when almost every family was largely self-sufficient, and if a man was a hired man one year and did not like to continue the next, he could go to the back concessions, and make a home for himself. We are living still in thought in the time when in this country there were almost unlimited opportunities. But I submit that that time has passed away. The free accessible lands then in Canada have almost gone. If one would to-day have a freehold homestead he must pass almost beyond the reach of the railways. I say this, having full knowledge of the fact, that across our western country there are almost 30,000,000 acres of arable land held out of cultivation. But the free, accessible lands are almost a thing of the past. A hundred years ago settlement on this continent consisted of a few scattered communities along the Atlantic seaboard. It took practically a hundred years and three or four generations of the peoples, in their westward movement, to reach the Pacific. To-day the large part of our natural resources within easy reach have been exploited, and the opportunities, which were present in the early days in this western country of ours with its rapid developments, are not so numerous. We forget that we live in an age of collective production; that we live in an age of "large scale" industry; that we live in an age of more or less monopoly of the necessities of life.

For example, on a large railroad like the Canadian Pacific railway, so many thousand men may be laid off, as they were about Christmas time. Those men become