

been, each for himself, and I suppose it worked fairly well when each had a fair chance, but there is nothing particularly sportsmanlike in giving one man tremendous privileges and putting others under a severe handicap. That is the position we have to-day, and it is this house that makes the rules. There is no doubt about that whatever.

I noticed in the Evening Citizen of March 23 the statement made by Mr. C. Fraser Elliott, the dominion commissioner of income tax, that dividends paid in Canada during 1934 reached a total of approximately \$350,000,000 as compared with \$150,000,000 for the previous year. That is, the arrangements in this country for which this parliament is responsible have enabled the dividend receivers of Canada to obtain \$200,000,000 more in the past year than in the year before. Now I cannot think that that is a matter for congratulation so far as the country at large is concerned. If everyone was benefiting in this way, we might

think it was a very happy condition, but everyone is not benefiting in this way.

Recently I had occasion to make a study, with the help of some friends, of some of the statistical information supplied by the Year Book and from the census. If the income tax returns are combined with the figures of earnings it is possible to show the distribution of income among a very large section of the population. I may say that we were not able to secure any information as to the distribution of farm incomes. But leaving out farm income, we have some 2,713,000 wage earners and other income receivers for whom it is possible to estimate the distribution of income for the year 1930-31. I have before me a table which gives the distribution of the number of income receivers, other than agricultural, and their income in Canada for the year 1930-31. This is a short table, and with the permission of the house I will place it on Hansard in its present form. It reads:

Table 3.—Estimated Distribution of Number of Income Receivers (other than agricultural) Canada, 1930-1931

Size of Income	Number of persons (Male and female)	Per cent of total	Income (millions of dollars)	Per cent of total income
Under—\$ 1,000..	1,526,000	56.2	790.0	25.4
\$ 1,000— 1,500..	643,000	23.7	805.0	25.9
1,500— 3,000..	448,000	16.5	896.0	28.8
3,000— 10,000..	85,000	3.2	401.0	12.9
10,000— and over..	11,000	0.4	219.0	7.0
Totals..	2,713,000	100.0	3,111.0	100.0

From this table it will be seen that 56.2 per cent of the income receivers, both males and females, receive less than \$1,000 per year. The total earnings of these workers constitute only one-quarter of the total income of all persons, although they form more than half of the aggregate number. Slightly less than one-quarter of the workers have incomes between \$1,000 and \$1,500, and the aggregate incomes of these persons are a little more than one-quarter of the total. The two groups receiving less than \$1,500 per year thus form approximately 80 per cent of the total number, yet they received only a little more than half of the total income. The other 20 per cent of the income receivers, those getting more than \$1,500 per year, secured almost half of the total income. The group with the highest incomes, those getting more than \$10,000, was composed of only 11,000 individuals, and yet this small group received an aggregate income equal to that of more than 400,000 of the poorest paid workers.

According to this statement, the great majority of the income receivers, that is, 1,526,000, receive less than \$1,000 per year. I would point out that the family budget as published by the Dominion Department of Labour provides for \$800 for food and housing for a family. On that basis a family would need an annual income of from \$1,200 to \$1,500 to meet the requirements for a decent standard of living but according to the statistics of the government the vast majority of the people of this country are forced to live on a standard below what would be considered as reasonable. There is no need for such things in a country like this possessing such great resources and splendid equipment. I think I did it earlier in the session, but I should like again to place before the house a statement taken from a national survey of potential product capacity made for the federal government of the United States. This report was prepared by some sixty technicians who worked for a period of seven