

The approximate wage in these families varied between \$624 to \$780 per annum.

If, as Father Lebel claims, a minimum budget for a family of five is \$1,200 per annum, then a sliding scale of allowances in such families as I have previously quoted will be necessary to carry out the spirit of the Act to make up the difference between the earned wage and the absolute wage claimed to be necessary. This would involve extremely heavy expenditures.

On the other hand, if a stated limited allowance is placed in a family where the wage earned is far below the absolute wage deemed necessary, the country is to be heavily taxed and yet not bring the family budget up to what is considered necessary, which would not be carrying out the spirit of the Act."

*By Mr. Woodsworth:*

Q. You say, "of the Act".—A. The proposed Act.

Q. There is no bill before us?—A. Just a resolution.

"The type of people earning such low wages, with whom Social Workers are in close touch, are frequently physically unfit, verging towards unemployable, with the added liability in many cases of a limited intelligence caused by mental defect, which precludes them from higher paid work.

Since it is not desirable to encourage the increase of families from such stock, whose children inherit poor physical health and mental defect, with the certainty that a large proportion of such children will be weaklings, becoming consumers and dependents, rather than producers, because of their unfitness, physically and mentally, it would seem undesirable and dangerous to encourage larger families among such a class of people.

It certainly does not seem desirable to tax the country heavily to supplement incomes among this class of people to enable them to bring more unfit children into the community already heavily burdened in caring for this class of dependent child.

There is no benefit to be obtained in increasing birth rate unless there is a fair guarantee that normal human beings are being born, not an increase of the unfit. It is largely the unfit who have the largest families, whose children are potential dependents to a large extent.

May I point out that should Family Allowances become law, it would be necessary to consider concurrent legislation, such as Mothers' Allowances, in every Province where Family Allowances are in force, in order to provide a continuing allowance in the family to replace Family Allowance on the death of the father and at a higher rate than is at present being paid in the Provinces where it operates, in order to bring the income up to the "absolute wage" mentioned by Father Lebel.

Since one of the basic reasons of the opponents of Family Allowances is increased birth rate, the implication of course naturally follows; what additional services are necessary to preserve the lives of the increased number of children? Will not provision have to be made for some continued allowance in families to preserve the lives of the children, which would be endangered by the desertion of the father or the sickness of a long period, such as a T.B. condition, where the wage earner is unable to earn for a long period.

We lose annually thousands of the lives of the children born in Canada to-day for lack of adequate provision for their health. Would not increased expenditures to preserve the lives we already have be more valuable to the country than launching upon a scheme rejected after trial in many other countries.

To-day nearly all communities need more adequate public health nursing systems, preventoriums for early cases of T.B. in children, convalescent homes for children discharged from hospitals, obliged to return their patients to homes