

try to increase the national income. That does not mean, as our friends of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation seem to argue, that a more or less equal distribution of the country's wealth should be made; that will not raise the standard of living. But if the national income is increased, the standard of living for all will be improved. We must all go down the road of success abreast; there is no use in seeking to safeguard our own class only.

I listened with great interest to the speech by the leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation (Mr. Coldwell) on the radio about two weeks ago. One thing that struck me was that when he was commenting upon the weakness of the old orthodox political parties he made some grand and glorious promises about a new order and a new world. There came to my mind stories that when an election was on, politicians would come to a town and promise the inhabitants a new post office, hoping to secure the votes of that community. But the leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation had them all stumped because he promised a new world.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): The Prime Minister promised a new heaven and a new earth.

Mr. WOOD: That would not be very interesting to some hon. members.

What about this new order? I have listened time and time again to these promises of freedom from want and all these other freedoms. There seems to be a belief on the part of some people, who, I am sure are sincere, that by creating certain conditions and changing things around they will be able to take the struggle out of life. I do not think it can ever be done. As long as this world is inhabited by human beings, most of us will have to be kicked upstairs. There is plenty of room there; but we need something to put us up there; it will not be done automatically, and I do not believe it would be a very good thing if that were so.

I should like to direct your attention, Mr. Speaker, to some views I hold and the reason why I take this stand. We talk about the distribution of wealth; we are told very often that there are a few people in this world who have control over great wealth while the rest are nothing but slaves and peasants of the very favoured few, who are able to reach underneath the chairs in which they recline comfortably and pull out anything they want while the rest of us have to get along with very little. If you analyse the income tax returns you will find that if you took everything away from those with incomes of more

than \$50,000 a year, which is considered the high income tax class, you would be able to maintain our war effort for only a very few weeks. I happen to have before me an article published by the Wood Gundy people, which shows the distribution of our bank deposits. Savings deposits amounting to \$1,000 or less account for 31 per cent of all savings deposits, and total some \$496,300,000. Accounts of from \$1,000 to \$5,000 total \$522,200,000, or 32 per cent of the total savings of the country. In other words, in this class there is practically 64 per cent of all the savings held by our small bank depositors. We have some \$3,100,000,000 lying in our banks, belonging to about 4,000,000 depositors. That is a pretty good percentage of the population of this country. We also have 2,500,000 people holding insurance policies, having an average value of \$2,000. Surely there never was a time in the history of this country when wealth was more equally divided than it is to-day. Some of us have perhaps had a little taste of how it feels to have some savings, and we want more. When we look around and see someone with more than we have, of course the human elements of jealousy and envy creep in; the have-nots envy the haves, and we begin to think we need a new order so that we may be placed in a favoured position. But I notice that generally the man in the most favoured position is the man who has earned it. I remember as a boy listening to a sermon in the Baptist church to which I went in the village; I remember that the subject was that the Lord does not trust everyone with talents to the same extent, and I thought there was a great deal to that. The reason why many of us have not very much wealth is that we cannot be trusted with it, and I have discovered that a great many people cannot be trusted in that way. Perhaps the greatest calamity that could happen to many people would be access to too much money. We have records to show that many men who at one time possessed some wealth lost it over a period of time, and it came into the hands of someone else. There is nothing permanent about wealth. We have the income tax, the succession duties and everything else to take away this wealth and hand it back to society, thus giving those who have not been able to accumulate anything a second, third, fourth and perhaps tenth chance to do so.

I notice that this new order is being discussed by many who belong to an element in the community who, as far as I can see, have never known what it meant to make a living,