

which people have produced, and which people need and unfortunately cannot buy? I suppose that all of us in this Chamber remember the burning of piles of coffee on the wharves because of the lack of a market in which to sell; we all recall the driving of hogs into the Mississippi; and I am sure that none of us will forget that in the disastrous days of depression through which we have passed our own elevators were full to the eaves with wheat that we could not sell. The purchasing power of the masses all over the world had been so depleted that they had nothing left to exchange for needed commodities. After they had paid the tax collector and the landlord, there was nothing left which they could trade with us for the food which they so sorely needed and which we would have been so happy to supply. In other words, you must keep purchasing power in the hands of your people.

Let me give you an illustration. The manufacturers of agricultural implements never close their plants, or cease operation, so long as the farmer can pay his notes; the manufacturers of food and clothing never discharge their employees in periods when the housewife has the wherewithal to furnish her table and clothe her children. To paraphrase a very old aphorism, "The shoemaker's children do not go barefoot when the shoemaker's customers can buy shoes and pay for them."

In other words, honourable gentlemen, purchasing power in the hands of the people is the key to business activity; and business activity is the sine qua non of a happy, industrious and prosperous people.

The Honourable C. D. Howe is a very great organizer. He is a genius at that sort of thing. He is now busily engaged in tooling up the factories for post-war production. But I suggest to you, that it will be futile to turn out radios, washing machines and refrigerators if there are no buyers to buy them. I would suggest that a super-organizer is not at all essential; just let dollars jingle in the pockets of the workers, and manufacturers and merchants will spring up like mushrooms in the night to supply all needs. My submission is that the way to promote business activity is to maintain purchasing power in the hands of the workers. The way to maintain purchasing power is to increase wages, not to decrease them.

Let me illustrate once again. The beneficent family allowance act distributes among the people, the workers in the main, something like \$200,000,000 a year in purchasing power. The effect of that \$200,000,000 is to-day being felt in the factories and on the farms of Canada.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. HOWARD: No doubt about it.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: When you discuss social legislation, you talk in millions; but, honourable senators, when you discuss wages you talk not in millions but in billions of dollars. The effect of increased wages to our workers, in keeping factories and farms active in this country, would be proportionately greater than the results obtained from the raising of money in the public treasury and handing it out in gifts to those who need it, and in saying this I am not objecting to social legislation.

During the war Canada's greatest customer was the Government. But, obviously we can no longer depend upon Government buying to keep our factories moving. The Government does not need to buy now. At least, the Government does not need to buy in such great quantities, because it does not now need to destroy in such great measure. We must distribute our products amongst our people. Why reduce wages under these circumstances?

The billions of dollars which during the last five years flowed into the boiling cauldron of war may now, if we are sufficiently wise, flow like sunshine into the homes of our people. It is within our power to produce in this country the grandest civilization that yet has been known upon this earth.

The honourable member from Peterborough (Hon. Mrs. Fallis) made a most excellent speech before the adjournment. It was a speech on the subject of employment, and I commend her for the thought which she has given to this vital question. She was rather critical, I admit, of the Minister of Labour for what she called his "airy remark": "There are jobs for all and to spare." She doubted the ability of manufacturing industry to absorb the thousands of men who are being discharged from our armed forces and our war factories. On the other hand, she found reason for optimism in contemplating the possibilities that lay in other fields of endeavour, fields other than that of manufacture. She enumerated farms, forests, mines and water powers. Well she might, honourable gentlemen, for these are the natural resources of our country. To the farms, the forests, the mines and the water powers, she might well have added the fisheries. She was right. She envisaged in the use of these natural forces a vast reservoir of paying jobs. She was right; what is a job after all but the transformation of natural commodities or forces into a form that satisfies human desire? I will go further than the Minister of Labour, who says there are jobs for all and to spare. I think he might have