

one per cent of the population, received ten billion dollars, the lowest income in the group being \$75,000, and the average \$300,000, while at the other end of the scale twelve million families, representing forty-two per cent of the entire population, received the same amount, namely ten billion dollars, but the highest income in this latter group was \$1,500, and the average, \$830. This situation prevails on a slightly different scale in both England and Canada. The trouble is, I think, that so much money is paid to so few people and so little money is paid to so many people that the many poor cannot buy the goods and services which they need, while the few rich do not need the goods and services that they can buy. How, for instance, could the average family in the group of thirty six thousand consume \$300,000 worth of goods and services? True, they actually do spend about \$50,000 each, but the other \$250,000 is saved. On the other hand it is easy to see how the average of the twelve million families who receive the \$830 each could spend four or five times that amount, if they only had it. So we see that the few rich do not buy these, to them; useless goods and services, and the poor cannot buy them, so they are not produced, for the simple reason that they could not be sold if they were.

Then our economy is turned to the manufacture of luxuries and the instruments of war; for there is no other way in which the profit system can be operated at this stage of its development. Pump-priming or public works programs may serve as palliatives to delay the coming of depressions; but the experience of the United States, which has pumped eighteen billion dollars into its flagging system during the last six years and which now has, according to the statement made by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Rogers) the other day, 21,000,000 persons on relief, should serve as a warning signal to us. While I welcome every reduction in trade barriers, I do not see how the new treaty can possibly effect a fundamental change in our situation. The masses of the people in most countries are so desperately poor that they cannot buy even the goods which they produce and which they need so badly. Wherever one looks, the desperate plight of the farmer is apparent.

I should like to refer to *La Tragédie Paysanne* by Marcel Braibant, in which he has something to say about the position of the French farmer. I desire to refer briefly to the position of the French farmer because we are trading with France. We cannot ignore the financial position of those to whom we want to sell our goods. I quote:

From 1892 to 1929 the number of small farms of less than 25 acres has decreased by 30 per cent.

[Mr. P. J. Rowe.]

The main cause is the economic condition of modern agriculture. Most peasants have been forced to leave by the economic regime of big capitalism.

The author proceeds:

The mechanism which has crushed the French peasantry is a complex one. Its development has coincided with the concentration of capital, industry and the commerce of agricultural provisions in fewer hands. During the second empire the manufacturers obtained commercial treaties by which the production of important products of the French soil was either totally or partially prohibited.

There you have it. Wherever you look, big capitalists and industrialists are making treaties in order that they may profit at the expense of the farmers. Again the same author has this to say:

Since the war French markets have been invaded by the apples, pears, peaches, fresh vegetables of California, Canada, South Africa, Italy and Spain, and by the dried vegetables of Chile and central Europe. Compared with before the war, 707 per cent more table apples have been imported and 1,430 per cent more plums. It is almost unbelievable. French commercial agreements are responsible for this. They have sacrificed their fruit and vegetable producers, most of them small farmers, in favour of exporting the products manufactured by some powerful industrial companies.

May I now glance for a moment at conditions in England? Messrs. G. W. Daniels and H. Campion in their standard work, *The Distribution of the National Capital*, show that 80 per cent of the capital of Great Britain is now owned by six per cent of the population. The fact that in all capitalist countries from 80 to 90 per cent of the wealth has got into the hands of from five to ten per cent of the people would not be such a serious matter were it not for the fact that the ownership of capital inevitably carries with it the receipt of all the really large incomes. Mr. O. R. Hobson, financial editor of the *London News Chronicle*, has made a calculation of how the British national income is divided. He says that in 1932-33 the total income was seventeen billion dollars, but that 12,000,000 people out of a total population of 46,000,000 received \$12,750,000,000. This would be over \$1,000 each or \$5,000 per family of five. The other 34,000,000 people received \$4,250,000,000, which would be an average of about \$500 per year per family of five. This explains why thirteen and a half million persons in England are, to quote Sir John Orr's words in his recent official report on food, health and income, "gravely undernourished."

The farmers of England are so desperate that only the other day, January 17 to be exact, press despatches from London told us that a delegation of 6,000 farmers had decided to march to the House of Commons for a