

skilled workmen which were not used. Something more than the mere existence of these is required. I suggest that what is required is a policy which will produce the commodities which the people of this country need, because they need them; a policy which will use the facilities of production to meet the needs of the people; a policy based upon the needs of the people, and not upon the profits that can be made from production.

The policy which the government is following to-day, as regards both farm prices and wages, is disconcerting to the Canadian public. It does not augur very well for the post-war period. The Canadian people to-day are living, or existing, at a standard much below that which is possible in this country. The policy being pursued by the government has the effect of maintaining that low standard of living.

Let me quote from evidence given under oath by a clergyman to a recent government commission, regarding the standard of living in his community. This is what he says:

I would say that about half of the homes I go in have not a sufficiently decent standard of living. I go into homes of men who work seven days a week, and are real industrious men, fine types of men, and yet they have not enough to live decently. I have been in this community for sixteen years, and I will say that those people have never had enough to live decently, and be fair to their families.

Later on, he says:

I would say that in about seventy-five per cent of the homes the men who work seven days a week are too tired to really enjoy life.

Speaking of their homes, he has this to say:

These old frame houses are very hard to keep warm. Some men are using two tons of coal a month to keep their houses fit to live in. They have no money with which to repair these homes.

Speaking of overcrowding, he says:

It is decidedly worse now than it has been in the sixteen years I have been in the community. I believe that there are two families living in homes that could comfortably accommodate one, and sometimes not that.

Speaking about one family of seven, he said:

They have one room downstairs. They use the kitchen downstairs for the living-room, kitchen and everything else. Then I think two bedrooms upstairs. They have to crowd the boys and girls together in the same room in winter time.

That is an illustration of the conditions under which some of our Canadian workmen have to live, and as a result of the government's policy they can receive no higher wages.

A few days ago the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Blackmore) placed on *Hansard* a record of the income shown by the dominion [Mr. Noseworthy.]

bureau of statistics for 87 per cent of Canadian wage-earners; that is the standard which to-day is frozen by government policy. That policy in effect decrees that 35.9 per cent of all Canadian wage-earners who in 1941 were in receipt of \$500, or less, shall remain at that level. These statistics show that another 28.4 per cent were in receipt of less than \$1,000; another 19.6 per cent in receipt of less than \$1,500, or a total of 83.9 per cent of all Canadian wage-earners in 1941 in receipt of less than \$1,500 a year. And that is where their income is frozen by government policy.

Let me point out that the Department of Labour, in its own official bulletin in April, 1941, stated that a pre-war wage of \$25 a week would leave a family practically no margin for expenditure on anything but the basic necessities of life. The amount of \$25 a week in 1941 would be equivalent to \$29.25 to-day. The \$29.25 a week amounts to about \$1,500 a year. In other words, 83 per cent of Canadian wage-earners in 1941 were in receipt of less than the Department of Labour itself considers a decent and fair standard of living.

Then, \$29.25 a week for a 48-hour week works out at approximately 62 cents an hour. Let us consider from the government's own record, the *Labour Gazette*, just how many people in Canada are in receipt of less than 62 cents an hour—\$29.25 a week or \$1,500 a year. Here are the statistics from the *Labour Gazette*: in Halifax, in 1941, eight companies paid from 37 to 43 cents—and the wages are still frozen at that level. In New Glasgow five companies paid from 34 to 45 cents. Twenty-nine pulp and paper companies paid from 25 to 50 cents; 44 manufacturing companies paid from 25 to 45 cents; 23 furniture companies paid from 25 to 45 cents, and so on down the list; until we have a majority of the plants in which wage-earners are employed paying at least \$6, or more, less each week than the Department of Labour's own estimate of what constitutes a fair wage income. Contrast this with what has been taking place in England. Official statistics based upon a survey made of six and a half million manual workers in England last fall show that the wages of those over twenty-one years of age had increased by 61.5 per cent over 1938, while those under twenty-one had received wage increases amounting to 77 per cent as compared with 1938.

Mr. HOMUTH: What was the rate per hour?

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: Among women workers the increase amounted to 77 per cent.