Mr. SALTSMAN: But what I want to draw your attention to is the percentage accruing to the members of a family or the ratio of the distribution to the output.

Mr. BRYCE: The relationship of the number of workers to the total population is largely influenced by the age distribution and after all we must remember that workers have to, in one way or another, support the young and the old who are not working. And then the proportion of the women employed in occupations which we recognize as productive from the national accounts point of view has been going up. In those ways the increase in the labour force has enabled an increased income per person in the population to be gained, but whether that increase goes wholly to those in the labour force or whether it is diverted, for example, through governments to old age pensioners—it may be diverted in that way to people not in the labour force—there are a whole set of influences at work and I rather hesitate to make a generalization without examining it.

Mr. SALTSMAN: If, for argument's sake, the participation of women in the labour force today were at the same rate as in 1949—

Mr. BRYCE: Mr. Rubinoff has the rates here and he can tell you about that.

Mr. SALTSMAN: —would not the figure we have of 51.5 be down? Would not the distribution or the true rate be less than this figure? Particularly if it has taken the increase in population to maintain its relationship to wages and salaries?

Mr. BRYCE: Any reason that increases the number of workers will have that sort of influence. But if the number of workers increases the total product to be divided increases. What is turning out to be stable is the relative share of the growing number of workers to the growing amount of capital and other things going into the value of production.

Mr. SALTSMAN: The point I was trying to make is this: Unless we realize that the labour participation is greater today, we cannot say the individual worker is getting the same share of the rewards of society today that he got in 1949. What I am suggesting is that although a gross amount as a percentage may indicate it has remained stable, in fact it has declined on an individual basis.

Mr. BRYCE: Mr. Rubinoff has been working out the figures here and he can give them to you.

Mr. RUBINOFF: Mr. Saltsman, it would appear that between 1949 and 1965 the overall participation rate is almost unchanged at something around 54 per cent of the population aged 14 and over. This was the result of a number of offsetting influences. As you quite rightly pointed out, a lot of women, and married women particularly, have gone into the labour force and their participation rate has gone up enormously. Recalling from memory, in the last 15 years it has gone up from something like 23 or 24 per cent of the female population to about 32 or 33 per cent. There has been a very large increase. On the other hand, earlier retirements and more school attendance, children staying longer in school, have tended to offset other participation rates of these age groups. By, I suppose, a remarkable coincidence the figure has not changed overall in this period of the last 16 or 17 years.

Mr. SALTSMAN: So the participation rate has remained fairly constant?

Mr. RUBINOFF: Yes, at about 54 per cent of the population who would participate. By convention they have chosen 14 years of age and over. They do not count the children younger than that.

Mr. BRYCE: We have not the figure at hand for the intervening years. It may have fluctuated.