

in connection with arthritis, seems to be the most sensible way of approaching the problem.

Mr. ADAMSON: Now that the Minister of Labour is in the house, I should like to make a suggestion with regard to day nurseries.

The CHAIRMAN: Day nurseries do not come under this national health vote.

Mr. ADAMSON: I believe they do. They are a definite consideration of the department, and were brought into being as a war-time measure. I want to bring out the fact that in a congested district such as my own, and such as is found in many parts of Toronto, war-time conditions still exist, and the need for these day nurseries is still a pressing one.

I realize that, to a degree, war industries have ceased to exist; but the congestion is still there, and the lack of housing accommodation makes the continuance of these day nurseries a necessary part of the health and welfare of Canada. While I realize that they were brought into being as a war-time necessity, so that married women, the mothers of small children, could work in war plants, the necessity for these day nurseries still exists.

I suggest to the Minister of National Health and Welfare that he reconsider carefully his decision to have nothing to do with the continuation of this necessary and helpful service. Possibly it is a provincial matter, but during this transitional period when there still exists a congestion of workers the need for day nurseries still definitely exists. With all due respect, let me say that it is an unfair burden upon the municipalities to expect them to carry the whole cost of these day nurseries. I suggest that the Minister of National Health and Welfare carefully reconsider his decision about abandoning support for these day nurseries.

Mr. KNOWLES: Before leaving this general item, I should like the minister to comment upon the matter to which I drew his attention last Friday night, and I believe the hon. member for Lanark referred to it as well. I have in mind the work being done at a place of which I gained some knowledge lately, the Montreal neurological institute. Those of us who spoke last Friday night on this item referred to the research work being done there and the tremendous help being given to a great number of people who suffer from diseases other than those which have been mentioned during the course of this debate.

Reference has been made to the international reputation of this institution. It seems to me that, if for no other reason than national pride in having an international

centre in this field within Canada, we should be prompted to do everything we can to enable that institution to do its best work. It is only a matter of a few weeks ago that Doctor Wilder Penfield, the superintendent of the institution, when addressing its annual meeting, implied that some of the work of the institution would suffer, even to the extent of closing down certain sections, because of lack of funds. I know there are always various technicalities that arise as between departments and as between governments, but I submit that the importance of this work and the self-sacrificing contributions of men like Doctor Penfield, Doctor Russel, Doctor Cone, Doctor McNaughton and those associated with them in their work should prompt us to find a way to give all possible support. I am sure that, knowing that there are those whose lives would be made happier and more free from some of the ills from which they suffer by the research that could be done there, should prompt our serious consideration of this matter.

Mr. CLAXTON: I should have referred to that because it was mentioned before by two hon. members. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre referred to the fine work being done by the Montreal neurological institute. As that happens to be in the constituency I represent, I was glad to hear the remarks of the hon. member. The reputation of the institute is, literally world wide and it has done a great work for Canada.

Doctor Wilder Penfield is one of the greatest brain surgeons, if not the greatest brain surgeon there is, and he has with him an outstanding staff. The hon. member suggests that on those grounds a grant should be made to the institution. No request that I know of has been made for a grant. I think here we must look at the position as it exists.

It is not a question of technicalities which may arise, as he said; it is a question of the realities of the Canadian constitution and the relationships which have been built up between the provinces and the dominion. There are a number of magnificent teaching institutions in Canada; there are a great number of churches which have done fine work, but that does not mean that everyone should receive a grant from the dominion government. It seems to me that here we have to look at the functions of government and consider which things can be done most appropriately and most in accordance with the lines of the constitution so that the essential needs of the Canadian people may be met.

We have made proposals to the provinces which bear on this, but at the present time I