

\$1,000, \$1,200, \$1,500, \$2,000 and up to \$2,500. From these income groups they were able to determine, according to what the family used and bought, whether these families had sufficient food, sufficient clothing, decent housing, and a minimum of sundries necessary to live in a civilized community. With the help of dietitians, with the help of physiologists, with the help of family experts and statisticians, they were able to divide them up, and say that people below \$1,400 or \$1,500—this was in 1918, with the prices prevailing at that time—did not have sufficient food, or clothing necessary for decency, or the type of houses that they required to live in with decency, or the proper amount of essential sundries. From \$1,500 to \$2,100 these families did have sufficient clothing, sufficient food, and so on. They chose 288 families from which the dietitians were able to build up a food average consistent with the caloric needs of the human being. These families earned from \$1,500 to \$2,100 per year. This was done with every group, and upon this basis they were able to construct a most comprehensive budget which they called the "Minimum Budget Necessary for a Worker's Family of Five." In that they gave the amount of food necessary for instance, not only as to the requirements in calories, but also in food values, and at the same time, gave an opportunity for the balancing of food, the balancing of menus, and the correct proportion of every requirement in sugars, vegetables and fruits, and so on. They did likewise with clothing, and divided the budget into the seasons, for a husband and wife and three children. I could give you those statistics later on.

Mr. McMILLAN: I think we got that pretty well last time.

The WITNESS: All right, we will exclude that. For a family of five, the father, the mother, a boy of 12, a girl of 6, and a boy of 2. They did that with house furnishings; from the people who received \$1,500 to \$2,500 a year, they determined what ought to be a decent amount of furnishings in the home for a family of five, namely for a living room, dining room, two bedrooms, and a kitchen. These are the minimum requirements. From these also they determined what ought to be the minimum expenditure for medical care, dentists, oculists, medicines, and so on.

Mr. HAMILTON: They would not have any wages left after that.

Mr. McMILLAN: It depends on what they got in the first place.

The WITNESS: We can discuss that later. I must point out that I think you are getting the idea that this is a theoretical budget. It is not. It is a budget of what people were actually using, and what they were paying for at that time; as to what it would cost in different parts of the country, was found when later repriced at different times of the year. They thus built up the quantity budget, as I said. This is what people ought to have; it is not an ideal budget; it is merely a necessary budget; it is not what people cannot improve upon; it is the bottom level that a family ought to have in order that they do not place themselves in danger of physical and moral deterioration. That was the assumption; and that was not only the assumption, but it was the proof. I think if we took the trouble to read many, many of the books—and I have read some—that show the ill effects of the insufficiency of income, you would see just what it means not to have sufficient food, etc. Fortunately, I may say, I did have occasion to see that often in practice. For some time before I went into research and cost of living work, I was a social worker in the city of Toronto, and had charge of a Family Welfare Department, which took care of all parts of the city. Toronto is a typical industrial city in Canada, perhaps the most typical,—together with Montreal. It is an industrial city and workers live there to a great extent. There are typical working class sections and typical poverty sections. The social worker sees the poverty sections, because she is in a position where she has to deal with those who are down and out, who somehow have