

Hodgson	Nowlan
Holowach	Pallett
Howe (Port Arthur)	Pearkes
Howe (Wellington-Huron)	Pearson
Huffman	Philpott
Jutras	Pickersgill
Kirk (Antigonish-Guysborough)	Pommer
Kirk (Shelburne-Yarmouth-Clare)	Prudham
Lafontaine	Purdy
Lapointe	Ratelle
Leduc (Gatineau)	Reinke
Leduc (Jacques Cartier-Lasalle)	Robichaud
Lefrançois	Robinson (Bruce)
Lennard	Robinson (Simcoe East)
Lesage	Rowe
Low	St. Laurent
Lusby	Simmons
MacDougall	Sinclair
MacEachen	Stick
MacLean	Stuart (Charlotte)
MacNaught	Thibault
McDonald	Tucker
McMillan	Tustin
Martin	Valois
Matheson	Villeneuve
Michaud	Weir
Montgomery	Weselak
Murphy (Westmorland)	Winters
	Wyllie
	Yuill—107.

Motion (Mr. Weir) agreed to on division and bills read a second time.

INDUSTRIAL STATUS OF WOMEN

MEASURE TO REQUIRE EQUAL PAY FOR EQUAL WORK

Mrs. Ellen L. Fairclough (Hamilton West) moved the second reading of Bill No. 2, to provide equal pay for equal work for women.

She said: Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to take very long today on the discussion of this bill, because this is the third time it has been presented to the house and the second time for it to be debated. In presenting the bill last year I produced certain arguments, and those arguments stand today as well as they did a year ago. Very little has happened in the meantime to change the picture, but I am hoping that what little has happened may have influenced certain members of the house in general and the Minister of Labour (Mr. Gregg) in particular.

Last year while speaking I quoted certain statistics from the publications of the dominion bureau of statistics, and some of these have changed slightly. One change that has occurred since last year is that in January of this year the government of the United Kingdom gave to its women employees legislation which would provide them with equal pay for equal work, the system of implementing that legislation being a graduated scale which in a few years will result in complete equality for these women.

Another thing has happened since last year. In replying to my remarks on the introduction of the bill last year the Minister of Labour

Industrial Status of Women

had the temerity to announce to the house that no representations had been made to him by the National Council of Women. I am sure the Minister of Labour has about as close a connection with that body as any member in the house, and he should have known that was likely to call forth an immediate response. In any event, he had his answer during the year. The National Council of Women have presented him with their request that this legislation should be supported by the government and later, in a brief which they presented to the government, they reiterated that request.

Since I spoke last year there has been a slight change in the size of the labour force and the number of women who compose a part of it. As of December 12, 1954, the latest figures available, the labour force was 5,414,000 of which men comprised 4,179,000 and women 1,235,000, or about 23 per cent. This is a larger percentage of the labour force than last year when the figure quoted was 22.2 per cent. It is interesting to note that in the period of almost a year which has elapsed the increase in the number of men in the labour force has been 13,000, whereas an additional 50,000 women have entered the labour force. These figures are significant.

Another significant factor is the number of women who pay taxes in this country. Inasmuch as these figures differ slightly from those which I quoted last year I should like to place on the record of the house the corrected statistics. According to the 1954 tax statistics the number of single women with no dependents paying taxes was 651,130, compared with 736,020 single men paying taxes. In other words, single women paying taxes comprise about five-sixths of the number of single men who paid taxes. With these statistics before us it seems odd that there should be any difference at all in the wages they earn for similar jobs.

Because of the short time available for this debate today, Mr. Speaker, and because I am anxious that some conclusion should be reached, I am going to rest my case very much on the argument I made last year. But I should like to reiterate the words of Mr. Kaiser, the United States government delegate to the international labour organization conference, which I quoted last year and which are found on page 40 of the seventh report of the committee on equal pay for equal work for women. Mr. Kaiser said:

The experience of the United States showed that the principle could be accepted alike by workers and employers; that it could be translated into practice; and that its application protected established wage rates against undercutting.

I think the latter part of Mr. Kaiser's remarks are significant, and I should like to