

in self defence and for purely economic reasons to do everything that lies in its power, not only to prevent deafness among its people but to enable those who are deafened to play a more impressive part in the scheme of life. Now, when discussing this question with individuals I cannot bring to mind a single instance in which the idea of the community suffering through deafness has not appeared to be so new as to cause an evident shock to their reasoning powers, and yet it surely must be evident that, by having a considerable proportion of the adult citizenry deprived largely of the capacity to produce and to do things, and to impress their ideas upon others, and generally to fill successfully their otherwise allotted part in the world, the community as a whole must experience a very serious loss. Let me cite an example:—

Let us suppose that a young man succeeds to his Father's business of manufacturing, in which a pay roll of say \$100,000 is distributed annually, and that at the age of 30—a very common time for deafness to become an insistent handicap—the young man decides that, because of his impaired hearing, he would probably make a failure of the undertaking, and the business as a result is wound up. Then in the succeeding thirty years, during which the business might have been expected to exist and at least to have held its own, there would be a lost distribution of wages in the community of \$3,000,000 not to mention the buying and transporting of raw materials, the handling of the finished product and the expending of profits earned.

Or let us suppose that a young man enters college with a view to fitting himself for one of the professions. He will probably stop at the end of his arts course, for by that time his deafness will likely have developed sufficiently to set him thinking deeply of future prospects, and he will go no further in his University work, because he will realize that in not one of the learned professions, including those of teaching and banking, is there room for a deaf man.

Or let him learn the business of distributing merchandise, either at retail or wholesale, in which frequent and close contact with the public is of paramount importance, how quickly will he be made to realize that he cannot hope to compete successfully with those more fortunately circumstanced.

And so, through practically every walk in life, one business, or profession or calling after another is given up, and the deaf man or the deaf woman falls into some insignificant niche, to be filled simply as a means of earning a paltry existence. Or, if we follow the deaf man into the later years of his life, how often do we find him entirely dependent upon others for a living!

Then again in public life. When have you heard of a man with impaired hearing, no matter how great his ability or how highly respected he may have been as a citizen, consenting to represent his fellows in any public administrative body? Moreover, it not infrequently is the case that men of unquestioned talent and wide experience suddenly are deprived of their hearing, and as a result are compelled to withdraw into private life. Two notable examples of this disaster in Canada have been those of Sir Clifford Sifton and Sir Allan Aylesworth, both outstanding figures in our Federal Parliament. Nor have they been by any means alone in this misfortune.

Do not all these things mean a loss and a serious loss to the community? Perhaps someone will say that the places of those who are thus forced to one side are filled by others, on the theory that "there are just as good fish in the sea as those that are caught in the net," a proverb, which to my mind has always appeared to be fallacious, for while there may be just as good fish somewhere in the sea, there is no guarantee that they will come within the