

take up the slack between outlying districts, where there are no doctors, and the idle doctors which are to be found in comparative abundance in any urban centre.

Let me enlarge upon the first of these reasons, and point out that, although I had no collusion or cooperation with the mover of the resolution, I find that his remarks in this connection are along lines similar to those I propose to make. Repetition may be tiresome, and I shall endeavour in this particular to detain the house for as short a time as possible. I have said that state medicine would limit the spread of disease and the incidence of death, and to bear out my contention I shall repeat some of the statements of the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. McIvor).

Every year thousands of Canadians die of preventable disease. Can anyone gainsay that statement? Secondly, one person in three dies prematurely of such disease. Over half of all disabling disease could be prevented. Three per cent of Canadians are continually sick. All hon. members are pretty well aware by this time that sickness costs the people of Canada the estimated sum of \$311,000,000 yearly.

To give more detailed information, may I say that diphtheria has killed as many as 1,200 persons in Canada in one year; typhoid fever has killed approximately the same number; tuberculosis destroys about 8,000 lives every year, and cancer destroys approximately the same number each year. Heart disease takes a yearly toll of about 11,700 lives. Maternal mortality in Canada runs up to 1,300 yearly. Prior to the activity of the various governments, in cooperation with the federal government, the incidence of venereal disease in Canada was appalling.

You say, "Well, what of it? There are too many people, anyway; why not let them die? To hundreds of thousands of people we are giving not only medical attention, but food, clothing and shelter. At a time like this would it not be just as well to refrain from a discussion of state medicine? Why not wait until we balance the budget, and until we settle our railway and unemployment questions?" There is good reason for many of those questions, because every time we reclaim an invalid from a serious illness we do so against the time he will take sick again. If the person happens to be an indigent, dependent upon the state, each time we cure his illness we place a further burden upon the state. You may ask: "If he was no good in the first place, why not let him die?" Unfortunately many of these people are suffering from infectious disease and we must control infectious and contagious

disease as a matter of protection to others. Diphtheria, scarlet fever, typhoid fever and so on, not to mention the venereal diseases, which are the worst of all, are conditions that have to be controlled. If we must control them for our own safety we might as well make a job of it and control them for the sake of those who are suffering.

I have said that I believe state medicine is a good idea, because, among other things, it would eliminate the uneven distribution of medical costs. The cost of illness must be common knowledge to hon. members of this house. I think it is a fair statement that about four-fifths of the citizens of Canada enjoy incomes of less than \$1,800 and that a large majority of the people would consider themselves very fortunate if they could be sure of an income of \$1,200 per year. A man with an income of \$1,200 or \$1,800 per year and who has a family to support usually has very little reserve. As a general rule he uses up one hundred per cent of what he earns.

I hope the house will not mind my discussing these matters in detail, but this is how it strikes me as a doctor. Should an ordinary case of sickness come along, such as a mild attack of grippe, this man goes to bed and calls in a doctor. Before he is well he owes his doctor and his druggist from \$10 to \$20. To many people, that may not seem much, but it is a lot to a man who uses up the hundred dollars he receives every month. If he has the misfortune to require the removal of an appendix, if he suffers from a strangulated hernia or something else that necessitates his going to hospital, he finds himself put back to the extent of a couple of hundred dollars. As a doctor I am meeting these cases all the time. A man with a family of three or four children who is receiving only \$100 per month finds it quite difficult to pay a bill of \$100. In this connection I should like to refer to some remarks I made in this house during the session of 1936. I said:

I believe it has been estimated that the cost of medical service to the Canadian people, largely a direct charge, is about \$311,000,000 a year. On the other hand it has been estimated that the cost of medical service to the people of the United States is something over \$3,500,000,000 a year, which figures out in both instances at around \$30 a head. During the regime of President Hoover an inquiry was undertaken as to the cost of medical service to the people of the United States.

And again:

Before this inquiry was entered upon it was realized that there was a great deficiency in medical service to the American people, and on the other hand it is well known that medical