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## INTRODUCTION

Surveys of Consumer Finances have been taken by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics since the early 1950's. Up to the present, ten reports have been published ${ }^{1}$ and data from the eleventh survey is being processed. The main objective of the surveys is to produce estimates of the income distribution by slze for families and individuals from data collected in national surveys of households. Apart from the standard questions about the amount and sources of annual money income the surveys have always collected data on some demographic and lahour force characteristics (or obtained this information by linkage with the monthly Labour Force Survey). The content of the surveys has never been standardized completely; in selected years additional questions on various related topics have been asked. For example, in four surveys (including the latest one taken in the spring of 1970) data on assets and debts have been collected in addition to income.

Although all Surveys of Consumer Finances have obtained some data about the respondent's labour force activity at the time of the survey, only once before have respondents been questioned about their work experience during the reference year. The survey taken in the spring of 1962 asked respondents to account for the 52 weeks in 1961 in terms of having worked, looked for work or done neither. Questions about the joh of longest duration were also asked. Such data are, of course, much more relevant in analyzing income and earnings than the usual point of time observation-usually reported in terms of labour force activity in the week preceding the survey. To obtain such data, however, is far more difficult-it is intricate to cover all the relevant information in a few questions and there is evidence of serious recall problems; as a result the quality of the data is affected by these problems.

An analysis of the 1961 data was presented as part of the report DBS Catalogue No. 13-521 Distribution of Non-farm Incomes in Canada by Size, 1961. The present report updates some of the 1961 tahles and in addition contains some new data. A summary comparison of the 1961 and 1967 data is presented in the following text. ${ }^{2}$ It is, of course, difficult to draw conclusions about the historical trend in the labour force participation patterns of individuals and its influence on incomes over time from two isolated observations spaced six years apart-cyclical and random influences may affect the data greatly. This was not the main ohjective of repeating the experiment anyway. A cross-sectional view of the influence of work experience on individual earnings and family

[^0]income in 1967 is a topic of some interest in its own right.

In April 1968 in approximately five sixth of all households interviewed for the Monthly Labour Force Survey, drop-off income questionnaires were left for all persuns aged 14 years and over who were in receipt of cash income in 1967. Nearly 38,000 such individuals completed satisfactorily the "1967 Income Questionnaire". ${ }^{3}$ They reported their labour force activity during the week preceding the survey on the Labour Force Schedule and also answered special questions on their labour force activity during 1967. The data collected on the Labour Force Schedule has been fully integrated with the person's income reporting and the present report focuses attention on the earnings reported by individuals and their work experience during 1967. The Labour Force Schedule and the Household Record Card provide ${ }^{3}$ a number of basic personal and family characteristics and these have been used extensively in the report in order to illustrate the varying impact an individual's work experience has on family income.

The tables in the Appendix place the data in the main tables into a broader context. Table A relates the 1967 labour force participants by age and sex to the corresponding population groups. Tables B and C present some data on labour force non-participants and part-year participants - their main reason for not working or looking for work and the type and average amount of income these persons received.

Tables 1-10 present data on individuals who either worked or looked for work in 1967 and the key variable in most tables are total individual earnings during 1967. This includes wages and salaries as well as net income from unincorporated businesses, farms and other types of self-employment. The estimates cover a somewhat different universe in:*

Tables 1-3 all persons in labour force in 1967 and reporting some money income

4-8 all persons reporting earnings for 1967
9 all persons reporting earnings for 1967 but also in labour force in April, 1968

10 all persons reporting wages and salaries for 1967.

It should be noted that "all persons in labour force in 1967" refers to an estimate of all persons aged 14 and over who either worked or looked for work at any time during 1967. This is sometimes referred to as the annual gross labour force and

[^1]is an extension of the usual standard measure that is applied to a reference week only.

Tables 11-19 concentrate on total income of family units-the distributions shown are by size of total money income received by families or unattached individuals. Tables 11-16 present data on families proper-groups of related individuals sharing one dwelling, whereas Tables 17-19 deal with unattached individuals - persons living on their own or in a household where they are unrelated to any body else.

Although the stuh variable in the above tables is total family income, average earnings and average transfer payments received per family are shown also. Average earnings are the average sum of wages and salaries and net income from self-employment received by all members of the family. Family data are cross-classified by the labour force activity of the family head in most tables, although Table 16 presents a somewhat more comprehensive view by showing the influence of other earners on family income.

It should be noted that a number of closely related tables on family incomes were included in the main report DBS Catalogue No. 13-534 Income Distributions by Size in Canada, 1967. Because of their traditional place in the general report they were included there although in terms of topic their inclusion in the present report could have been argued. Some examples are - with bracketed numbers referring to the numbering system of tables in main report (Catalogue No. 13-534):
Table (6) Percentage Distribution of Families by Income Groups by Number of Income Recipients and by Number of Income Earners, 1967
(8) Percentage Distribution of Families by Income Groups and Occupation of Head, 1967
(16) Percentage Distribution of Hushand-wife Families by Presence of Children and Lahour Force Participation of Wife, 1967.

The main report also contains a number of tables on individuals that use either current (at time of survey) or year's labour force characteristics as classifying variables. However, the distributions and averages shown are usually in terms of total money income and not earnings of the individual. In any case, for a complete picture of the data on work experience obtained from the Survey of Consumer Finances 1968 both reports should he consulted-it was often a decision hased on previous practices whether a table was putlished as part of the main report or included in the present special report.

The main report (Catalogue No. 13-534) has to be consulted also for a more detailed description of sources and methods. An attempt is being made to provide in the present report the most essential information for the proper use of the data-a description of the data source, concepts and definitions used, etc. However, far more detailed descriptions on some technical aspects of the survey were provided in the main report. Users should consult it on topics such as estimation techniques and reliability of estimates.

For any remaining questions of a technical or subject matter nature inquiries should be directed to Consumer Finance Research Staff, Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Ottawa.

## NOTES AND DEFINITIONS

In this report a labour force participant is a person 14 years or older who worked or looked for work in 1967. If a person did neither at any time in 1967 - he or she is a non-participant. Footnotes to tables specify any further exclusions or adjustments to these definitions. ${ }^{3}$

An earner is a person who received in 1967 wages and salaries and/or net income from an unincorporated business, farm or profession. An income recipient is a person who in 1967 received some money income from any of the thirteen sources specified on the questionnaire.

[^2]A family is defined as a group of individuals sharing a common dwelling unit and related by blood, marriage or adoption. Thus, all relatives living together were considered to comprise one family unit whatever the degree of family relationship. Unattached individuals are persons living by themselves of rooming in a houschold where they are not related to other household members.

The Survey of Consumer Finances collected data on money income received in 1967-the questionnaire specified 13 different categories to he reported. These income components add to total income. Average income referred to in tables should he interpreted as mean total income per individual of family. Median income in Tables 11-16 is the median total family income. Similarly, in Tables

17-19 medtan hivome refers so the :minpolnt in the tis:: inutions by size of total income of unattached inciv iduals.

## Eamings consist of:

1. Kages and Salaries: gross wages and salaries bafore deduction for such items as income taxes, thamployment insurance and pension funds. Commission income received by salesmen as well as secasional earnings of baby sitters, paperboys, charwomen, etc. are also included in this category. fill incume in kind such as meals or living accomodisthas is excluded.

Where individuals received military pay in the form of reserve army pay, and where this was a minci part of total income, such income was incoued in earnings.
2. Net income from self-employment: net income (k.oss income minus expenses) earned from selfsumployment either on own account or in partnership for an unincorporated business or in independent arofessional practice. Included here is net income trom operating a farm.

Net income from farming was to be reported by all individuals who operated their own or a rented ferm either on own account or in partnership. Field instructions specified that net income was to be cilculated by substracting farm operating expenses wicurred during 1967 and depreciation of farm assets toum farm cash receipts. The latter were to include all money receipts in 1967 from the sale of farm products including supplementary and assistance wayments from governments. Income in kind is escluded.

Transfer payments conslst of all social welfare payatents from municipal, provincial and federal sovernments such as Old Age Security, Guaranteed liscome Supplement, Old Age Assistance, pensions under Canada and Quebec Pension Plans, unembloyment insurance benefits, workmen's compensadon, training allowances, veterans' pensions and allowances, mothers' allowances, pensions to the blind and the disabled. In the survey, family and youth allowances are treated as part of the income of the father or guardian although legally the pay1:3nt goes to the mother.

So the difference between eamings and total mincome is accounted for by net income from roomers a:nd boarders, ${ }^{\circ}$ government transfer payments, inwestment income, retirement pensions and other wiscellaneous non-capital type money receipts.

Average earnings and average transfer payments phblished in Tables 11-19 were calculated by divtaing segresates by the remper of familles or

[^3]mathathed hidividuas in the column f.e.. these are not averages per recipient unit only.

The industry classification used in Table 3 is hased on the industry divisions in the Sundard Industrial Clas sification Manual ${ }^{7}$ w ith four divisions agriculture, forestry, fishing and trapping, and mines, quarries and oil wells - being grouped into "primary industries".

The occupational classification in Table 9 follows closely the hroad occupation divisions used in other DBS statisties such as labour force surveys and the census. ${ }^{\circ}$ In some cases where the sample yield was very small it was necessary to combine the data for several occupational divisions. Thus, it was necessary to combine and puhlish one joint distribution for farmers, loggers and fishermen; and miners, quarrymen and related workers were comhined with craftsmen, production process and related workers.

The above definition of labour force participation implies that "number of weeks in the lahour force" is the sum of "number of weeks worked" and "number of weeks unemployed"."

It should he also noted that a "labour force participant" is not synonymous with "earner". A labour force participant may have had zero cash earnings in 1967 and not appear as an earner in the statistics for any of the following reasons:
(1) having been an unpaid family worker;
(2) having received no cash wages and salaries in 1967 (e.g., been paid in kind, or been paid in 1968 for work performed in 1967);
(3) having broken even in his own husiness or farm i.e., having had no profit or loss to report:
(4) having kept one or more roomers or boarders in her own home and reported some net income from this source (not defined as earnings here);
(5) having immigrated to Canada in 1967 or early 1968 and having reported weeks worked ahroad but no Canadian earnings: ${ }^{10}$
(6) having participated in the 1967 labour force only as an unemployed person - never actually having worked in 1967.

On the other hand, some persons in receipt of earnings in 1967 may have been labour force non-

7 DBS Catalogue No. 12-501, Standard Industrial Classification.

- See DBS Catalogue No. 12-596, Occupational Glassification Manual, Census of Cunada, 1961.
iflcation Manual, Census of Canaila, 961 . tuiv reproduced on page 45 .
${ }^{10}$ Although not specified on questionnaire the inbation was to collect Canadian earnings. Detalled Gatructions in the enumerator's manual reflect this restriction and questionnaires were edited to remove income earned while residing abtoad. The same restriction wats not applied to the "Ocuks worked" amashors.
 i907 ior work performed in previous period.

The report concentrates on income and earnings as the dependent variable and uses work experience and personal characteristics as explanatory variahles. For this reason in the individual tables (Part I) the universe corered is usually "all earners" or all habont forme barticipatis fil receipt of incoma.
 (Part II), on the other hand, deal with the total universe covered by the survey, but always distinguish between units whose head was a labour force participant in 1967 and those whose head was a non-participant. A family of the latter type nearly always has income to report and often this is income earned by memhers other than the head and for that reason such families are relevant in the study.

## EARNINGS ANI I ABOUR FORCE PARIICIPATION $196 \%$

## Comparison of Lamings and Work Patterns, 1961-67

Although the Survey of Consumer Finances have undargone a major change in coverage during the Drtod by starting to include farmers and their families, some historical comparison of the data are possible. Because of the special definition of "farmer" used in this series, ${ }^{11}$ there were less than 300,000 individuals in 1967 who would have been classified as such, and their influence among the 8.2 million labour force participants with income is minor unless special subgroups are examined in Which farmers are heavily represented, e.g., among male self-employed persons. In some cases a crude adjustment to the 1961 data was possible to allow for the non-inclusion of farmers, but most comparisuns suffer from this inconsistency in the data sources. Another serious drawback in attempting a historical comparison are the widely differing bconomic conditions in the two years. In 1961 the annual average rate of unemployment was 7.1 per cont of the labour force whereas in 1967 the unemployment rate was 4.1 per cent. Consequently, any ohserved differences in work patterns are caused by a mixture of historical trends and cyclical intluences.

No comparison against 1961 census data will he attempted because of special difficulties of reconciling the coverage of the survey with that of the census. It should be noted that data published in 1961 Census of Canada Vol. III, Part 3 Wageearners: Earnings and Employment) are not comvarable with the data in the present report. The ahove mentioned census volume deals with wages and salaries only, excluding all self-employed mersons. Earnings in the current report are defined as wages and salaries and/or net income from selfEmployment.

Ail comparisons with 1961 that follow are made atainst data obtained from the Survey of Consumer Finances taken in the spring of 1962. Most of these data were published in DBS Catalogue No. 13-521 Distribution of Non-farm Incomes in Canada by

[^4]Size, 1961 or in DBS Catalogue No. 13-529 Income Distributions, Incomes of Non-farm Families and Individuals in Canada, Selected Years, 1951-65. Occasional use is made of unpublished material from the same source.

## Individuals

An adjustment was made to the 1961 data for the non-inclusion of farmers in order to get an idea about the change of the proportion of female to male labour force participants. The adjusted 1961 data indicates that approximately 28 per cent of the gross labour force was made up of women, in 1967 this ratio had risen to 32 per cent. The well-documented trend of rising female participation rates in some age groups is reflected in the data when the "gross participation rates" are compared by broad age groups.

## Estimated Gross Participation Rate of Women ${ }^{2}$ by Age, 1961 and 1967

$1961^{2} \quad 1967^{3}$

## Age group

| 24 years and under | 44.3 | 51.4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 25-44 years | 34.5 | 42.5 |
| 45-64 " | 33.7 | 39.6 |
| $65+$ | 5.9 | 7.6 |
|  | 33.0 | 40. |

[^5]The surveys indicate that average annual earnings of all labour force participants had increased during the six-year period from $\$ 3,842$ to $\$ 5,314$ for males and from $\$ 1,839$ to $\$ 2,445$ for females. ${ }^{12}$ The above

[^6]figures are not adjusted for the inconsistency in coverage and there is an indication that non-farm male earnings rose by somew hat more than 40 per cent over the six-year period. Female earnings are hardly affected by the coverage problem and consequently increased by approximately 33 per cent. It should be noted that the Consumer Price Index rose from 100.0 in 1961 to 115.4 in 1967 so substantial real gains accrued to males as well as females, approximately 20 per cent and 15 per cent respectively on the average.

Average earnings (in current dollars) for males and females who worked $50-52$ weeks during the year increased at a very similar rate-for males from $\$ 4,750$ to $\$ 6,245$ and for females from $\$ 2,562$ to $\$ 3,374$ or by somewhat more than 30 per cent over the six-year period. In fact, average earnings of individuals with less than full-year work increased hy more than that - for males as well as females.

In 1967, as can be expected in a year of low unemployment, a higher proportion of male labour force participants worked the full year; this can be ohserved in all "relationship to head" groups in Table 1 except among sons 20 years or under. Among the latter 42.8 per cent instead of 31.5 per cent reported having worked in 1-14 weeks, presumahly most of them at summer jobs which may have been more easily available in 1967 than in 1961.

A lower proportion of male participants reported any unemployment -14.8 per cent in 1967 compared to 22.8 per cent in 1961. Especially the proportion of males reporting 30 weeks or more of unemployment is nearly halved and the average total income of males who suffered unemployment of such long duration is up by 47 per cent. Earnings in 1967 accounted for a smaller share in total income of these males than other sources indicating an above average increase in transfer payments compared to other income sources. However, even in 1967 males with 30 weeks or more of unemployment reported only on the average $\$ 474$ in government transfer payments (including Unemployment Insurance Benefits). ${ }^{13}$

Although more women (in absolute numbers as well as a proportion) were in the labour force in 1967 than in 1961 the work patterns have changed only marginally. For 1967, 57 per cent of female labour force participants reported having worked in $50-52$ weeks instead of 55.5 per cent in 1961 . This overall increase in full-year workers is most pronounced among female heads and wives - for both

[^7]groups a 5 percentage point increase has occurred. On the other hand, for daughters under 20 years old a substantial decrease in full-year work was estimated; only 25 per cent of girls aged 14-19 living at home worked in 50-52 weeks compared to over 34 per cent in 1961. A corresponding increase in partyear work for these girls can be onserved with nearly 38 per cent reporting short-term employment (1-14 weeks) compared to 24 per cent in 1961.

In Canada, unemployment rates for women are always lower than for men. For that reason, the observed changes by weeks unemployed are rather small in percentage points and it hecomes difficult to judge whether the change is significant or not. In 1967, 88.7 per cent of all female labour force participants reported no unemployment -a 1.5 percentage point increase from 1961. At the same time, the proportion of women reporting long-term unemployment (30-52 weeks) had not changed; 2.1 per cent against 2.2 per cent in 1961 does not constitute a statistically significant change.

## Families

Compared to 1961 no change is ohserved in the proportion of families whose head was a labour force participant. As hefore, only 13 per cent of all families had heads who had neither worked nor looked for work in the reference year. However, a higher proportion of participant heads reported having worked in 50-52 weeks; this proportion rose from approximately 76 per cent in 1961 to 83 per cent in 1967. ${ }^{14}$ Lower unemployment rates were at least partially responsible for this change.

Average income for families with non-participant heads showed an increase much in line with the increase experienced hy families headed by full year workers. Average family incomes (in current dollars) for these two groups increased by 37-38 per cent over the six-year period. Surprisingly the largest increase in family incomes was reported by families whose head reported working 49 weeks or less. Average income for such families rose by 46 per cent from 1961 to 1967.

Ohviously family incomes are influenced in a substantial way by factors other than the head's own work experience. Among such factors are the work experience and earnings of other family memhers and the level of transfer payments received by families. On the first point there is evidence that other family members are on the average contributing more to family incomes than in 1961. The average numher of earners has increased from 1.39 in 1961 to 1.55 in 1967. ${ }^{15}$ On the other hand, head's income as a proportion of total family income shows the following changes:

[^8]
## Ratio of Head's Income/family Income

$$
\begin{gathered}
1961^{1} \quad 1967^{2} \\
\text { per cent }
\end{gathered}
$$

Families, head worked $50-52$ weeks.... $84.4 \quad 80.7$ Families, head worked 49 weeks or less $76.8 \quad 72.9$ Families, head did not work.................. $42.9 \quad 48.9$

All families $80.3 \quad 77.5$

1. Unpublished data from SCF 1962.
2 Unpublished data from SCF 1968.

The only category where head's income has become proportionately more important is among families with non-participant heads, presumably due to higher transfer payments received by the head. However, for all families and for families with heads in the labour force the importance of head's income has declined. This in conjunction with the evidence that earnings for the family as a whole have not declined in relative terms, suggests that the earnings of other family members have gained importance as a component of family income.

## Composition of Family Incomes, 1961 and 1967

|  | $1961^{2}$ | $1967^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | per | ent |
| Earnings | 88.7 | 89.3 |
| Transfer payments | 6.6 | 6.0 |
| Investment income | 3.4 | 3.1 |
| Miscellaneous | 1.3 | 1.6 |
| Totals | 100.0 | 100.0 |

[^9]Transfer payments, on the other hand, have decreased in relative term when family incomes for 1967 are compared with those of 1961. Possibly because family allowances, being in aggregate one of the most important types of transfer payment received by families, have changed little over the period while other income components have risen suhstantially.

The somewhat decreasing dependence of family incomes on the head's earnings can also be demonstrated by comparing family incomes by the number of weeks the head was unemployed during the reference year.

## Ratio of Family Incomes ${ }^{1}$ by Number of Weeks Head Was Employed, 1961 and 1967

$1961^{2} 1967^{3}$

per cent

| Number of weeks head was unemployed: |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| None ${ }^{4}$ | 100 | 100 |
| 1-9 weeks | 77 | 78 |
| 10-19 | 64 | 70 |
| 20-29 | 55 | 61 |
| 30-52 | 39 | 48 |

[^10]Clearly, in 1967 family incomes decreased less as the head's period of unemployment lengthened, so they must have been less dependent on the head's earnings.

## Unattached Individuals

Unattached individuals, persons living by themselves or in households where they are unrelated to anybody else, form an unstable population that is subject to rapid fluctuations reflecting demographic and socio-economic factors. For that reason historical comparisons will reflect to a large degree the structural changes in the population rather than the behavorial or economic factors in respect to labour force participation and work experience.

For the group as a whole the changes over the six-year period can be summarized in the following table.

Work Experience and Changes in Average Income for Unattached Individuals, 1961-67

|  | Proportion |  | Percentage increase in average income $1961-67^{3}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $1961{ }^{1}$ | $1967{ }^{2}$ |  |
|  | per cent |  |  |
| Of all unattached individuals: |  |  |  |
| Labour force participants ...... Labout force non-participants | 64.5 35.5 | 69.7 | 44 |
| Of all labour force participants: |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Unattached individuals who worked in 49 weeks or less ............... | 36.8 | 30.0 | 44 |
| Unattached individuals who experienced no unemployment............. | 79.3 | 85.4 | 41 |
| Unattached individuals who experienced some unemployment......... | 20.7 | 14.6 | 49 |
| Unpublished data from SCF 1962. <br> ${ }^{2}$ Calculated from Tables 17 and 19 pp. 33 and 34 (present repo |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

However, the composition of unattached individuals in the two years is substantially different in respect to age and sex, and possibly other characteristics. In 1967 more males and more younger people helonged to this group than in 1961. Data are not available to standardize on these important characteristics and make more valid comparisons. For these reasons, the above table should be considered as purely descriptive.

## Full-time Workers and Other Earners

In selecting the tables that would be of the most general interest, the majority of data in Part I of this report deal with "all earners". ${ }^{16}$ However, in some cases a distinction has been made between full-time workers and other workers, in others between full-year earners and other earners. These classifications are hased on two questions on the Labour Force schedule - about the number of weeks

[^11]in which a person had worked in 1967 and whether the work durlng these weeks had been mostly fulltime or part-time. ${ }^{17}$ So a full-year earner is a person reporting earnings for 1967 and work in 50-52 weeks regardless how many hours a week he worked. Table 6 in the report shows the percentage distrihution of earnings for males and females for such earners and contrasts it with the earnings of individuals who worked in 49 weeks or less. In the latter case, average earnings are about 60-65 per cent lower than those of full-year workers. Full-year male workers reported average earnings of $\$ 6,274$ whereas those with 49 weeks or less work reported $\$ 2,592$. For females, the corresponding averages were $\$ 3,421$ and $\$ 1,235$.

We know from Table 1 that 74.7 per cent of male and 63.5 per cent of female labour force participants worked 50-52 weeks in 1967. From another point of view the same data show:

[^12]
## Percentage Composition of Full-year Workers and Part-year Workers ${ }^{1}$ by Sex and Relationship to Family Head, 1967

|  | Labour force particlpants who worked in |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 50-52 |  | 1-49 |  |
|  | per cent |  |  |  |
| Male Head | 73.5 |  | 55.2 |  |
| Sons under 20 years.... |  | 24.9 |  | 13.0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Female ..................................................................................... | 26.5 |  | 44.8 |  |
| Head |  | 6.5 14.0 |  | 5.5 25.4 |
| Daukhters under 20 years ........................................................................................ |  | 14.0 1.4 |  | 25.4 9.7 |
| Daughters 20 years and over ...................................................................................... |  | 3.6 |  | 9. 7 |
| Other .................................. |  | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |
| Totals | 100.0 |  | 100.0 |  |

${ }^{1}$ Labour force participants who did not work at allin 1967 have been eliminated from this table. There are still other marginal differences, between the concept of labour force participant and earner but for most purposes the above table can he used as a description of the universe in Table 6.

Full-year workers are predominantly male, and the majority of them are heads of family units. ${ }^{18}$ Somewhat less than half of part-year workers are women, and wives are the largest group among them. However, it should be noted that 31.1 per cent of all part-year workers or 783,000 were male heads of family units. Their part-year work pattern may be due to voluntary or involuntary reasons (unemployment). In fact, 540,000 of them reported some unemployment during 1967.

If, in addition to weeks worked, the answer to the question on the nature of the work is taken into

[^13]account another more homogeneous grouping of earners can be examined. All persons who reported earnings for 1967 and who worked 50-52 weeks mostly full-time, ${ }^{10}$ have been designated as "fulltime" earners, whereas all persons working in 50-52 weeks on a part-time hasis and persons who worked in 49 weeks or less are grouped as "other earners". Based on this classification approxima-

[^14]tely 71 per cent of male earners, but only 46 per cent of female earners fall into the "full-time earner" category. In comparison with the "fullyear" definition discussed ahove, the number of persons who worked in 50-52 weeks but mostly part-time and who now are removed from the "fulltime earner" category was approximately 182,000 males and 256,000 females. Considering the much larger base of male earners in total the difference
between the male full-year and full-time workers is rather minor compared to the difference in the two female groups. ${ }^{20}$ This must be borne in mind when Table 6 is compared with the following table.

[^15]Percentage Distribution of Individuals by Size of Earnings, Work Experience and Sex, 1967

${ }^{2}$ Persons reporting earnings who worked $50-52$ weeks mostly full-time.
${ }^{2}$ Persons reporting earnings who worked 49 weeks or less and persons who worked $50-52$ weeks mostly part-time.

Unfortunately, no detailed data similar to the data on full-year workers, about the composition of the full-time eamers group were produced. For males this is not a serious matter as the groups differ only marginally. However, it would have been of considerable interest to observe the characteristics of the group of females who make up the difference between full-year and full-time female earners. This group of females accounts for approximately 10 per cent of all female earners and their earnings averaged $\$ 1,858$ in 1967.2

The largest number of male full-time workers earned $\$ 5,000$ to $\$ 6,000$ in 1967 -this was the modal group in the distribution of earnings. They earned $\$ 6,415$ on the average in 1967 compared to $\$ 5,322$ for all male workers. Full-time female workers reported average earnings of $\$ 3,746$ compared to $\$ 2.454$ for all female workers. The vastly different annual work patterns for males and females have been commented on already and the effect of their

[^16]influence on female/male earnings differentials will be discussed in the following section.

## Work Patterns and Female/male Earnings Differentials

Differences in earnings between men and women are due to many factors, the most important ones among them being a different occupational distribution, differences in education, training, accumulated work experience, etc. ${ }^{22}$ In addition, there is the suspected problem of discrimination-in certain situations women may be paid less than men for equal work. A factor that also contributes to the substantial difference in male and female annual earnings is the difference in annual work patterns; more women than men work less than the full year and more women are part-time workers than men. The combined effect of these two factors can be

[^17]called the "annual hours worked effect", although it is only a proxy for the actual hours worked during the year. This factor has in the past been shown to be less important than the unfavourable occupational distribution of women workers, ${ }^{23}$ but is still suhstantial and may be gaining in importance. The present data permit a closer look at this aspect of female/male earnings differential.

Ratio of average<br>female/male earnings<br>per cent

 46.1

$$
58.4
$$

Among the two components making up the "annual hours worked effect", the "weeks worked" is the more important influence. Average female and male earnings move closer together by approximately 8 percentage points when earnings of workers who worked in 50-52 weeks are compared rather than all workers. Having worked these weeks on a full-time rather than a part-time basis eliminates another 4 points in the ratio. ${ }^{24}$

A comparison by broad occupational groups shows that the 8 percentage point average difference ranges from 1 to nearly 13 percentage points in selected occupational groups depending on the different proportion of full-year workers among men and women.

Ratio of average female/male earnings

## All earners Full-year earners

 per cent ${ }^{1}$| All occupations ${ }^{2}$ | 46.1 | 54.5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Managerial ............. | 41.1 | 42.5 |
| Professional and |  |  |
| technical | 49.3 | 53.4 |
| Clerical ................ | 62.0 | 65.3 |
| Sales | 33.2 | 37.6 |
| Services and recrea tion $\qquad$ | 39.2 | 51.5 |
| Transport and communication .......... | 55.3 | 62.7 |
| Miners. craftsmen, and related workers $\qquad$ | 46.6 | 50.5 |

[^18][^19]It is tempting to draw parallels hetween the findings from the 1961 Census data and the above estimates. The ratio of average female/male earnings was 54.2 for all earners and 59.3 for fullyear, full-time earners in 1961, ${ }^{25}$ compared to 46.1 and 58.4 in 1967 . However, there are major conceptual and coverage differences that make a comparison invalid. In the Census monograph wage-earners rather than all earners were used, omitting selfemployed workers; those who worked, in 49-52 for 35 hours a week or more (at least "usually") were defined as full-year, full-time workers-quite a different definition from the one used here.

Data from the Survey of Consumer Finances taken in the spring of 1962, indicated that average female/male earnings ratios were: 47.9 per cent for all earners, 53.9 per cent for full-year earners and 56.3 per cent for full-time earners. However, here again, problems of data comparability introduce uncertainty into the conclusions that can be drawn; the questions about full-time, part-time work were phrased differently for $1961^{26}$ and the inclusion of farmers in 1967 may have biased the data. However, disregarding these problems the data indicate that the overall female/male earnings differential has not narrowed, but earnings of full-time females is somewhat closer to male full-time earnings. These conclusions are very tentative; in addition to the doubts about data comparability there is the problem of statistical significance which for technical reasons cannot be tested properly. The apparent increased importance that "annual hours worked effect" has on female/male earnings cannot be tested without a substantial volume of consistent data (preferably for more than just two points in time). At present such data are not avallable.

## Income Sources and Labour Force Participation

## Individual Labour Force Participants

According to Table 1 there were $5,582,000$ males and 2.643.000 females who either worked or looked for work in 1967 and reported some cash income for the year 1967. Data in Tables 1, 2 and 3 pertain to these two groups of individuals. Tables 4 to 8 deal with a marginally different universe with persons reporting earnings. ${ }^{27}$ The following discussion ahout the income composition is hased on unpuhlished data that was tabulated for la hour force participants. However, because of the marginal difference between this group and earners the analys is is also valid in respect to earners.

According to the survey definition earnings consist of wages and salaries and net income from self-employment. ${ }^{20}$ Total income includes, hesides

[^20]earnings, government transfer payments, investment income, retirement pensions and other miscellaneous income components.
(which will not in all cases be the same as their status during 1967) total income consisted of the following components:

If lahour force participants are classified by their employment status at the time of the survey

# Composition of Income Received by 1967 Labour Force Participants, by Sex and Employment Status, Spring 1968 

| Employment status at time of survey (April 1968) | Estimated numbers | 1967 <br> average total income | Percentage composition of total income |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Wages and salaries | Net income from selfemployment | Other sources |
|  | ${ }^{\prime} 000$ | \$ |  |  |  |
| Males: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employee | 4,357 | 6,018 | 93.2 | 1.6 | 5.2 |
| Self-employed, non-farm | 441 | 7,622 | 40.4 | 50.2 | 9.4 |
| Self-employed, farm ..... | 322 | 3,660 | 14.4 | 73.8 | 11.8 |
| Unpaid family worker ${ }^{1}$........................................... | 26 | 1,132 | 73.9 | 14. 4 | 11.7 |
| Not in labour force | 436 | 2, 083 | 70.0 | 7.3 | 22.7 |
| Totals | 5, 382 | 5,677 | 84.0 | 9.6 | 6.4 |
| Females: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employees .... | 1,996 | 2,981 | 96.0 | 0.4 | 3.6 |
| Self-employed ..................................................... | 79 | 1,876 | 35.8 | 41.7 | 22.5 |
| Unpaid family worker ${ }^{1}$........................................ | 10 | 1,145 | 66.9 | 9.9 | 23.2 |
| Not in labour force ............................................... | 558 | 1,242 | 85.6 | 0.7 | 13.7 |
| Totals | 2,643 | 2,574 | 93.6 | 1.4 | 5.0 |

${ }^{1}$ Only those persons who were unpaid family workers in the spring of 1968 but had some cash income to report for 1967.

Source: Unpublished data, SCF 1968.

Male labour force participants received on the average only 6.4 per cent of their total income from other sources than earnings, for females this percentage was even lower -5 per cent on the average. Particularly employees, who receive over 90 per cent of their income from wages and salaries, reported on the average very small amounts of unearned income.

It should he noted that according to survey conventions family and youth allowances are attributed to the father or guardian of the child. If this component is disregarded, dependence of male and female labour force participants on earnings becomes roughly equal. In hoth cases about 95 per cent of total came from earnings and other income sources played a very minor part. This statement is, of course, based on a comparison of proportions, and males had in absolute terms substantially more non-earned income than females.

Approximately 90 per cent of male labour force participants and 98 per cent of female labour force participants reported some wages and salaries. Tahle 10 shows that wages and salaries were $\$ 5,292$ for male and $\$ 2,470$ for females -averaged over reporting individuals.

There were 557,000 males and 64,000 females who reported earnings but no wages and salaries -
i.e., they were in receipt of net income from selfemployment. Farmers were numerically the most important suhgroup among them.

Self-employment income is of little importance for female labour force participants as a group. For males, however, nearly 10 per cent of total income of all male participants comes from operating farms and businesses or engaging in a professional practice. Also about 10 per cent of male earners report only net income from self-employment, no wages and salaries and another 4.6 per cent report earnings from several sources -in some cases a combination of wages and salaries and net income from self-employment, and in others a combination of net income from farm and non-farm sources.

The income composition tahle ahove indicates that non-farm self-employed males are particularly likely to be reporting wages and salaries and/or net income from self-employment. This may he partially a reflection of the multiple activities pursued by non-farm self-employed-either simultaneously, or moving during the year hetween johs as employees and self-employed persons. However, a classification prohlem may contribute to this mixed picture: unpublished DBS studies have revealed that a substantial number of owners-managers of incorporated businesses (particularly in cases of family-owned private corporations) are
classified as selfemployed in the Labour Force Survey although legally they should be considered to be employees of the incorporated business. This misclassification can he due to confusion on the part of enumerators or the person heing interviewed very frequently the housewife rather then the labour force participant is the person interviewed in the Labour Force Survey. The income questionnaire, however, is completed personally by each individual aged 14 years and over. Thus situations arise where a businessman running an incorporated business is classified as self-employed in the Labour Force Survey (and the Survey of Consumer Finances accepts the coding of the Labour Force Survey without alterations) but he reports his income correctly as wages and salaries and/or dividends.

This problem in classifying business people has been well documented internally in DBS and the 1971 Census or Canada will include a question on the population sample questionnaire (Form 2B) on whether the business is incorporated or not. It is hoped that the additional question will permit a more precise classification of the persons class of worker status and eliminate some of the inconsistencies between status and income reporting. The substantial proportion of income received as wages and salarles by non-farm self-employed males is at least partially a reflection of the fact that the group contalns some individuals who would be considered employees if a more rigorous system of classification were applied.

## Family Income and Labour Force Participation of Family Heads

Although the comparison of 1961 and 1967 data indicated that the head's contribution to family
income through its earnings had somewhat decreased in importance, the head's ability and willingness to work is still a crucial determinant of the family's income position. Tahles 11 to 13 describe the major differences in family incomes where the family head worked in 1967 and where he (or she) did not work. Theoretically, famllies shown in columns with the heading "head-participant" include some cases where the family head did not work but only looked for work in 1967, but for all practical purposes their number is very small and "tahour force participation" and "working" can be roughly equated. Table 13 shows that only 59,000 family heads or 1.8 per cent of all families among the "head-participant" group had reported working in 9 weeks or less.

Differences in family incomes are striking when families with participant heads are compared with families whose head was not in the lahour force in 1967. Average family incomes of the latter group were only about half of the average income of the former group. Tahle 11 shows that nationally the figures were $\$ 4,338$ for families with non-participant heads and $\$ 8,098$ for families with participant heads - a ratio of 53.6 per cent. Table 12 indicates that regionally this ratio varies from 45.4 per cent in British Columbia to 61.9 per cent in Quebec. Of course, in terms of hasic characteristics the two groups of families are very dissimilar. From Table 11 it can be calculated that males headed 96.3 per cent of families in the "participant" group and only 67.6 per cent of families among the "non-participant" group; concentration of families with female heads is relatively high among the "non-participant" group. From unpuhlished data, it was calculated that the age distribution is also very different for the two groups.

Percentage Distribution of Families by Age of Head and Labour Force Participation in 1967

| Age group of head | In the labour force | Not in the labour force |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | per cent |  |
| 24 years and under. | 5.9 | 1.9 |
| 25-34. | 24.0 | 5.5 |
| 35-44. | 27.8 | 7.3 |
| $45-54$ | 22.7 | 10.2 |
| 65 years and over. | 15.0 | 13.5 |
| Totals | 100.0 | 100.0 |

Source: Unpublished data, SCF 1968.

Families with elderly heads are the dominant group among the "non-participant" group of families. Because of the heavy weight of female heads and elderly families, the average family size and average number of children is much lower among the "non-participant" families than among the "participant" ones. Unpublished data show that the 3.9 million families whose heads were labour force participants in 1967 averaged 3.5 persons and
1.3 children per family, whereas the 596,000 families whose head was not in the labour force averaged 2.2 and 0.4 respectively. Thus the much lower family incomes among the latter group must be evaluated in the light of these basic differences.

Another study prepared from the same survey material and published as DBS Catalogue No. 13-536 Statistics on Low Income in Canada, 1967 examines
the status of families headed by full-time workers, ${ }^{29}$ families headed by part-time workers ${ }^{30}$ and families headed by persons who did not work in 1967 in respect to low income cut-offs or "poverty lines". These cut-offs are graduated as to family size and the analysis is thus more oriented towards an assessment of income adequacy. Data on family incomes in the current report is not appropriate for such analysis for reasons discussed ahove.

It should he noted that Tahles 11 to 13 classify families by the labour force participation of the family head and that regardless of the head's status other family members may have worked in 1967. In this text, families are sometimes referred to as "participants" or "non-participants" hut this is only being resorted to for the sake of brevity. Up to this point, no information ahout the labour force participation of other family members than the head has heen used. With the help of the additional unpuhlished information that "participant" families had on the average 1.6 earners and "non-participants" 0.5 earners, it is possible to speculate that "participant" families had on the average a greater number of "other earners than head" than "nonparticipant" families. On the other hand, the prohahility of working in respect to an adult family member other than head was greater in a "non-participant" family than in a "participant" family. This apparent paradox is caused by the difference in the average number of adults in the two types of families. In "participant" families there were on the average 2.2 adults or 1.2 other adults besides the family head and on the average 0.6 of them reported earnings. In "non-participant" families there were 1.8 adults or 0.8 other adults than the head, of whom 0.5 on the average reported earnings. Thus the prohability of working for adult family members (other than head) is in "participant" families 1 out of 2 and in "non-participant" families 5 out of 8.

The "average earnings" puhlished in Tables 11-13 are the combined earnings of all family members. Among families where the head did not work other family members contributed on the average $\$ 1,810$ in earnings to family income. This constitutes about 42 per cent of total family income whereas for families whose head was a labour force participant earnings accounted for 93 per cent of total family income $(\$ 7,528$ out of $\$ 8,093$ as per Table 11).

Transfer payments from governments were considerably more important for "non-participant" families. Less than 4 per cent of average family income was derived from this source by "participant" families whereas for "non-participants" nearly 35 per cent of total income come from transfer payments. Similarly income sources other than

[^21]earnings and transfer payments were of negligible importance for "participant" families but accounted for nearly 24 per cent of family income in case of "non-participant" families. Ten per cent or over two fifths of this miscellaneous income was identified as retirement pensions and annuities - not surprising if the age structure of these families is recalled,

The above discussion about the income composition is hased on overall averages for the two groups - all families where the head worked in 1967 and all families where he did not. It is expected that there are substantial differences in the income composition if these two groups are further subdivided - e.g., by family income size. Further analysis of this is of considerable interest but cannot he pursued in the present context.

## Unattached Individuals and Labour Force Participation

Of the 1.5 million unattached individuals approximately two-thirds worked or looked for work in 1967 and ahout one-third did not. Ahout 70 per cent of the labour force participants worked in $50-$ 52 weeks and over 85 per cent reported no unemployment. The discrepancy in these two proportions is accounted for by unattached individuals who worked less than a full year and withdrew from the labour force for the remaining weeks (see Table 19).

Tahles 17, 18 and 19 describe the income distribution of unattached individuals according to their "degree" of labour force participation. Table 17 shows that income of participating unattached individuals averaged $\$ 3,967$ against $\$ 1,624$ for the non-participants. Again among the non-participant, a higher concentration of women and elderly are found; the majority of labour force participants were male ( 55 per cent), but females dominated the nonparticipant group-nearly two thirds of the group were women. Unpublished data show that over half of the non-participating unattached individuals were 70 years old or older and about two-thirds were 65 years or older. Among the labour force participants 30 per cent belonged to the youngest age group -24 years of less, and over 45 per cent were in the prime age groups -25 to 54 years old. Average earnings for unattached individuals who worked in 1967 were $\$ 3,703$ on the average (Table 17). A more detailed comparison by sex (Table 17 and Tahle 1) indicates that working female unattached individuals averaged higher earnings than all female lahour force participants - $\$ 3,060$ against $\$ 2,445$. However, unpublished data indicates that unattached females are more likely to work on a full-time hasis than other women in the labour force. Nearly 78 per cent of them worked in 50-52 weeks and we know from Table 1 that the overall proportion of women working the full year is only 57 per cent.

On the other hand, male unattached individuals who worked had on the average lower earnings than all male labour force participants $-\$ 4,231$ against $\$ 5.314$, although they also were more likely to work throughout the year than all male lahour force participants. The tabulated data were inadequate to
explain this difference, but it is likely related to the age distribution of male unattached individuals compared to other males in the lahour force, particularly those who are heads of families.

Unattached individuals who were labour force participants derived 90 per cent to 95 per cent of their income from earnings; the overall average was 93.3 per cent -91.5 per cent for females and 94.5 per cent for males. They were in receipt of negligible amounts of transfer payments - only about 2 per cent of total ineome came from this source. This is in sharp contrast with the non-participating unattached individuals for whom as a group transfer payment constituted over half of their income. This is not surprising considering the high concentration of elderly, who often derive their whole income from old age pensions and Guaranteed Income Supplement.

As an interesting corollary some of the data from the report on low incomes can be cited. Among the unattached individuals below the low income cut-off 57.3 per cent males and 64.9 per cent of females had not worked in 1967.31 The income of

[^22]unattached individuals below the low income cut-aff consisted of: ${ }^{32}$


Of the unattached individuals with $\$ 1,740$ of income or more only 13.5 per cent of males and 22.0 per cent of females had not worked in 1967." Their income consisted of: ${ }^{36}$

| Earnings | Transfer <br> payments <br> per cent | Other <br> sources |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| Male .......................... | 90.8 | 3.1 | 6.0 |
| Female ..................... | 80.2 | 5.3 | 14.5 |

${ }_{32}^{32} \mathrm{~J}$ bid, Table 21.
${ }^{33} \mathrm{Jbid}$, Table 16A.
${ }^{4}$ lbid, Table 21.
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T 1 ifi. 1. Percentage Distribution of Individuals ${ }^{1}$ by Employment Experience, Relationship to Head and Sex, 1967


[^23]TABLE 2. Averare Earnings of Individuals by Iducation, Age and Sex, 196 i

| Education | All labour torce participants' |  |  |  |  |  |  | Fubl-tame warkurs: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { All } \\ \text { age } \\ \text { groups } \end{gathered}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24 \text { years } \\ & \text { and } \\ & \text { under } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 25-34 \\ & \text { years } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|c\|} \hline 35-44 \\ \text { years } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline 45-54 \\ \text { years } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|r\|} 55-64 \\ \text { years } \end{array}$ | 65 years and over | $\begin{gathered} \text { All } \\ \text { age } \\ \text { groups } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24 \text { years } \\ & \text { and } \\ & \text { under } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 25-34 \\ & \text { years } \end{aligned}$ | $35-44$ years | $\begin{aligned} & 45-54 \\ & \text { years } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 55-64 \\ & \text { years } \end{aligned}$ | 65 years and over |
|  | dollars |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Elementary schooltra - None or some | 3,712 | 2,064 | 3,851 | 4.422 | 4.046 | 3,675 | 2,400 | 4. 469 | 3,330 | 4. 400 | 5.030 | 4. 517 | 4,448 | 3,182 |
| Elementary schooling - Complete .... | 4,733 | 3,047 | 4,876 | 5,227 | 5,360 | 4,572 | 2,880 | 5.221 | 3,931 | 5,244 | 5,484 | 5.673 | 4,930 | 3,980 |
| Secondary schooling - Some | $4.8 \pm 7$ | 2,302 | 5,629 | 6,394 | 6, 168 | 5,508 | 3,026 | 5,990 | 4,362 | 5,943 | 6,658 | 6. 480 | 6,166 | 3.897 |
| Secondaty schooltne - Complete | 6,143 | 3,448 | 6,35? | 7. 488 | 7,538 | 7.130 | 5,272 | 6,911 | \$.684 | 8.606 | 7.828 | 7.788 | 7, 481 | 7,189 |
| Unlversity - Some | 5,398 | 2,138 | 6, 322 | 8,080 | 9,644 | 9,254 | 4.360 | 7.792 | 4,775 | 6,964 | 8, 285 | 9,892 | 9,643 | 5,238 |
| University - Degree | 10,914 | 3.971 | 8,572 | 12,828 | 14,422 | 13,680 | 8,819 | 11.987 | 5.619 | 9.439 | 13.077 | 14,818 | 11.208 | 11,369 |
| Elementary schooling - None of some | 1.638 | 1.180 | 1.705 | 1,902 | 1,864 | 1,444 | 1.307 | 2.422 | 2,047 | 2,539 | 2,631 | 2,600 | 2,022 | 2.344 |
| Elementapy schooling - Complete | 1,845 | 4.442 | 1.819 | 1.906 | 2,044 | 1.972 | 1,623 | 2,796 | 2,930 | 2,987 | 2,922 | 3,036 | 2.779 | 2.672 |
| Secondary schoolling - Some | 1,988 | 1.438 | 2,268 | 2,380 | 2.470 | 2,626 | 1,444 | 2,799 | 2.933 | 3,547 | 3,511 | 3. 571 | 3,605 | 2.646 |
| Secondary schooling - Complete ...... | 2,893 | 2, 396 | 3,158 | 3,239 | 3,303 | 3,544 | 2,310 | 3.933 | 3,270 | 4,398 | 4,328 | 4,268 | 4, 433 | 3,583 |
| University - Some | 3,129 | 1,990 | 3,892 | 4.022 | 4,231 | 4,640 | 2,006 | 4,919 | 3.839 | 5,313 | 5,384 | 5.142 | 5,829 | 4,293 |
| University - Degree. | 4.900 | 3.751 | 4,856 | 5,019 | 6,442 | 5,607 | 5,864 | 6, 498 | 5.287 | 6,188 | 6,685 | 7,667 | 7,821 | 8,125 |

${ }^{1}$ See footnote 1, Table 1.
${ }^{2}$ All individuals who worked 49-52 weeks in 1967 mostly full-time.

TMBLE: 3. Average Income and Average Earnings of Individuals ${ }^{1}$ by Industry Divisions and Sex, 1967

| Industry division | Averare income |  |  | Average earnings |  |  | Average earnings of full-time workers ${ }^{3}$ |  |  | Proportion repurting full-time work" |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
|  | doliars ${ }_{\text {der cent }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prlmary industry | 3.744 | 3.919 | 1.319 | 3,380 | 3,538 | 1.197 | 4,108 | 4.134 | , | 62.6 | 65.7 | 19.8 |
| Manufacturlng | 5,168 | 5,900 | 2,663 | 4.924 | 5.612 | 2,572 | 5,978 | 6,493 | 3.484 | 71.3 | 76.3 | 54.1 |
| Construction | 5,354 | 5.447 | , | 4,991 | 5,071 | 2.987 | 6,534 | 6.654 | , | 50.8 | 50.7 | , |
| Transportation | 5,564 | 6.047 | 3,008 | 5,276 | 5.734 | 2.855 | 6.228 | 6,492 | 4,162 | 73.1 | 77.1 | 52.1 |
| Trade | 4,282 | 5,448 | 2,146 | 4.017 | 5,106 | 2,021 | 5.536 | 6. 201 | 3.227 | 61.9 | 74.3 | 39.2 |
| Finance | 5,483 | 8,051 | 2,910 | 5,074 | 7,336 | 2,808 | 6,517 | 8.555 | 3,679 | 88.9 | 80.1 | 57.6 |
| Services | 4,016 | 6,320 | 2,583 | 3,757 | 5,879 | 2,447 | 5,606 | 7,386 | 3,884 | 54.4 | 70.1 | 47.7 |
| Public administration | 5.353 | 6.091 | 3,229 | 5.038 | 5,712 | 3.101 | 6,230 | 6.793 | 4,210 | 72.2 | 76.1 | 61.0 |

[^24]TABLE 4. Percentage Distribution of Individuals ${ }^{2}$ by Size of Earnings, Provinces and Sex, 1967

| Earnings group | Atlantic Provinces |  |  |  |  | Quebec | Ontario | Prairie Provinces |  |  |  | British Columbia |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Region total | New-foundland | Prince Edward Island ${ }^{2}$ | Nova Scotia | New Brunswick |  |  | Region total | Manitoba | Seskatchewan | Alberta |  |
|  | per cent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All earners |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Under $\$ 500$ | 12.8 | 12. 8 | 16. 8 | 13. 1 | 11.7 | 7.9 | 8. 5 | 11.6 | 11.6 | 9.9 | 12.6 7 7 |  |
| \$ 500-\$ 999 | 10.0 8.5 | 10.3 9.8 | 14.9 11.6 | 9. 3 8. 3 | 9.9 7.4 | 6. 2 | 6.8 4.9 | 7.8 7.1 | 8.9 6.9 | 7.5 7.3 | 7.3 7.2 | 7.5 5. 4 |
| 1,500-1.999 | 7. 4 | 9. 7 | 11.8 | 6. 3 | 6. 2 | 5. 2 | 4.2 | 5. 4 | 6. 7 | 6.0 | 5. 4 | 4. 5 |
| 2,000-2,499 | 7.0 | 8. 5 | 5. 6 | 6. 2 | 7.1 | 6.6 | 4. 4 | 6. 0 | 6.5 | 6. 6 | 5. 3 | 4. 6 |
| 2,500-2,999 | 7.2 | 7.6 | 7.9 | 7.3 | 6. 8 | 6.0 | 4. 5 | 5. 6 | 5. 6 | 6.0 | 5.4 | 6 |
| 3,000-3,499 | 7. 2 | 6. 3 | 8. 8 | 7. 8 | 6.9 | 7.4 | 5.0 | 6. 2 | 6. 1 | 6. 6 | 6. 1 | 5. 1 |
| 3,500-3,999 | 6.5 | 6. 3 | 3.7 | 6.7 | 7.0 | 7.7 | 5.6 | 5.6 | 5. 7 | 6.1 | 5. 2 | 5. 3 |
| 4,000-4,499 ........................................ | 6. 3 | 4.8 3.7 | 4. 5 | 7. 5.2 | 6. 9 5. 9 | 6.6 6.5 | 6. 5 | 6. 5. 5.7 | 6.4 5.9 | 6.6 5.4 | 5. 5.7 | 4. 5 |
| $4,500-4.999$ $5,000-5,499$ | 5. 7 | 3. 7 | 4. 2 | 6. 1 | 6.1 | 6.5 7.3 | 6.7 | 5.6 | 6.4 | 5.9 | 5. 0 | 4.9 |
| $5,500-5.999$ | 3.4 | 3.0 | 1.5 | 3.9 | 3. 4 | 4.8 | 6.0 | 4.9 | 5.5 | 5. 1 | 4. 4 | 4.8 |
| $6.000-6.999$ | 5.1 | 5.6 | 2. 5 | 4. 6 | 5. 9 | 8.0 | 10.7 | 7.1 | 7.2 | 6. 4 | 7.4 | 10.9 |
| 7,000-7,999 | 3. 1 | 3.0 | 1.1 | 3.1 | 3. 4 | 5.1 | 6.4 | 5.1 | 3.9 | 4.6 | 6.2 | 7.5 |
| 8,000-9,999 | 2.6 | 2. 1 | 1. 4 | 2. 6 | 3. 2 | 4. 5 | 6. 8 | 5. 6 | 4. 7 | 5. 4 | 6. 3 | 8. 1 |
| 10,000 and over | 2. 2 | 1.9 | 0.3 |  |  | 5.0 | 7.1 | 4.6 | 4. 1 | 4. 5 |  |  |
| Totals | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100. 0 | 100.10 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100. 0 | 100.0 |
| Average earnings ....................................... \$ | 3,250 | 3,021 | 2, 285 | 3.364 | 3,447 | 4,300 | 4. 852 | 4,020 | 3.812 | 3.983 | 4. 172 | 4,587 |
| Median earnings......................................... \$ | 2.798 | 2,434 | 1.783 | 2,965 | 3, 064 | 3,850 | 4, 468 | 3,526 | 3,474 | 3, 507 | 3,566 | 4. 185 |
| Male earners |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Under $\$ 500$ | 7. 5 | 8.8 | 9. 5 | 7.6 | 6.1 | 5. 3 | 4. 4 | 7. 3 | 7.1 | 6. 1 | 8. 1 | 6. 1 |
| \$ $5000-$ \$ 999 | 8. 0 | 7. 9 | 14.5 12.1 | 7.0 6.9 | 8. 3 5.8 | 4. 3 3.7 | 4.3 3.0 | 5.5 5.3 | 7.1 4.7 | 5. 22 | 4. 7 | 4.8 3.5 |
| $1,000-1.499$ $1500-1.999$ | 7.4 6.3 | 9. 1 | 12.0 | 6.9 5.0 | 5. 5.3 | 3.7 | 3. 0 | 5. 3 | 4. 3 | 6. 2 | 5. 6 | 3.5 3.0 |
| 1,000- 2,499 | 6.7 | 8.9 | 6.3 | 5. 6 | 6.3 | 5.2 | 2.8 | 4.7 | 4.3 | 5. 8 | 4. 3 | 3. 0 |
| $2,500-2,999$ | 7.0 | 8.2 | 8.5 | 6.8 | 6.1 | 4.9 | 2.9 | 4.3 | 4.2 | 4. 4 | 4. 3 | 3. 6 |
| $3.000-3,499$ | 7. 3 | 6. 8 | 9. 4 | 8. 0 | 6.6 | 6.1 | 3.4 | 5. 1 | 4.4 | 6. 3 | 4.7 | 3. 9 |
| $3,500-3.999$ | 7.1 | 5.7 | 4.0 | 7. 8 | 7. 9 | 7.2 | 4.4 | 5. 1 | 5.7 | 5.7 | 4. 4 | 4. 0 |
| 4,000-4.499 | 7.0 | 5. 3 | 5. 2 | 8.1 | 7. 3 | 7. 0 | 5. 9 | 6. 6 | 7.7 | 7. 1 | 5. 8 | 4. 3 |
| $4.500-4.999$ | 6. 2 | 4. 6 | 4. 1 | 6. 6 | 7. 3 8.0 | 7. 2 | 6. 2 | 6. 8 | 7.6 8.5 | 6.0 | 6. 7 | 6. 4 |
| 5,000- 5,499 | 7. 4 | 5. 8 4.0 | 5. 6 | 8. 1 | 8. 0 4. 5 | 8. 9 5. 9 | 8. 7.7 | 7. 4 | 8. 5 | 7.5 6 | 6. 5.6 | 6. 6.4 |
| $5,500-5,999$ $6,000-6,999$ | 4. 5 | 4. 7. 1 | 1. ${ }^{\text {3. }} 6$ | 6. 2 | 7.9 | 10. 5 | 14.6 | 9.5 | 9.8 | 8. 2 | 10.2 | 14.8 |
| $6,000-6,999$ $7,000-7,999$ | 4. ${ }^{\text {4. }} 3$ | 4. 1 | 1.6 | 4. 3 | 4. 9 | 6.8 | 9.1 | 7.1 | 5. 8 | 6.0 | 8.7 | 10.8 |
| 8.000-9,999 | 3.5 | 2. 9 | 1. 7 | 3. 4 | 4. 4 | 6. 2 | 9. 8 | 8.0 | 6. 9 | 7.5 | 8. 9 | 11.8 |
| 10,000 and over ......................................... | 3.0 | 2. 5 | 0.4 | 3.4 | 3.2 | 6.9 | 10.5 | 6. 7 | 6.0 | 6.2 | 7.4 | 9.5 |
| Totals | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100. 0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100. 0 |
| Average earnings ....................................... $\$$ | 3,832 | 3,479 | 2,618 | 4,013 | 4, 106 | 5. 045 | 5. 979 | 4.884 | 4,664 | 4.703 | 5. 131 | 5. 753 |
| Median earnings .......................................... \$ | 3,485 | 2, 932 | 2.147 | 3,698 | 3,947 | 4. 659 | 5,609 | 4,624 | 4, 604 | 4,358 | 4.798 | 5.741 |
| Female earners |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Under \$500 | 24.8 | 23.8 |  | 25. 0 | 23.8 | 13. 9 | 16.8 | 20. 6 | 20.3 | 19.3 | 21.4 | 23.0 |
|  | 14.6 | 17.0 |  | 14. 3 | 13.3 | 10. 6 | 11.5 | 12.7 | 12.4 | 13.2 | 12.7 | 12.9 8.5 |
| 1.000-1.499 .............................................. | 11.2 | 11.6 |  | 11.3 9.1 | 10.9 8.3 | 9.1 7.9 | 8. 6 | 11.0 7.3 | 11.3 | 9. 9 | 11.3 6.9 | 7. 7.4 |
| $1.500-1,999$ $2,000-2.499$ | 10.0 7.7 | 13.9 7.6 |  | 9.1 | 8.3 8.8 | 7.9 9.9 | 6.6 7.5 | 8. 6 | 10.7 | 8. 5 | 7. 3 | 7. 9 |
| 2,500-2,999 | 7. 7 | 5. 9 |  | 8. 3 | 8.2 | 8.7 | 7.7 | 8.3 | 8.1 | 10.2 | 7.5 | 6. 6 |
| $3,000-3,499$ | 6. 9 | 4.7 |  | 7. 3 | 7. 6 | 10.5 | 8.1 | 8.7 | 9.4 | 7.5 | 8. 8 | 7. 6 |
| 3.500-3.999 | 5. 2 | 7. 8 |  | 4.5 | 4.9 | 9. 0 | 7.8 | 6. 6 | 5.8 | 7. 0 | 7.0 | 8.0 |
| 4,000-4,499 | 4. 7 | 3. 3 |  | 4.9 | 5.8 | 5. 4 | 7. 6 | 4. 8 | 4. 1 | 5. 6 | 4. 8 | 4. 9 |
| $4,500-4,999$ | 2. 2 | 1. 2 |  | 2.3 | 2. 6 | 4. 7 | 5. 7 | 3. 5 | 2. 5 | 3.9 1.8 1. | $\begin{aligned} & 3.9 \\ & 1.6 \end{aligned}$ | 3. 6 |
| 5,000 - 5,499 | 1. 8 | 1.5 |  | 1.8 0.8 | 2.0 0.9 | 3.6 2.3 2.3 | 4. ${ }^{\text {2. }} 5$ | 1.9 2.0 | 2. 2.6 | 1.8 1.3 | $\begin{array}{r} 1.6 \\ 2.0 \end{array}$ | 1. 7 |
| 5,500. 5,999 ........................................... | 0.7 | 1.3 1.3 1.4 |  | 0.8 1.0 1.0 | 0.9 1.7 | 2. 3 2. 3 | 2. 5 | 2.0 | 2. 2.1 | 1.9 | 2.1 | 3.3 |
| 6.000-6.999 .................................................. | 1.2 | 1.4 |  | 1.0 0.6 | 1.7 0.3 | 2. 1.2 1.2 | 3. 1.1 | 2. 0 | 0. 3 | 1.3 | 1. 2 | 1. 0 |
| 8,000- 9,999 | 0.6 | . |  | 0.9 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 1. 0 | 0.8 | 0. 4 | 0.4 | 1.2 | 0.9 |
| 10,000 and over .......................................... | 0. 4 | 0. 2 |  | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0. 2 | 0. 5 | 0.4 |
| Totals | 100.0 | 100.0 |  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100. 0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Average earnings ........................................ | 2,900 | 1.749 |  | 1.942 | 2,007 | 2, 583 | 2, 628 | 2, 230 | 2,183 | 2. 215 | 2. 267 | 2. 284 |
| Median earnings ........................................... ${ }^{\text {. }}$ | 1.472 | 1,396 |  | 1.472 | 1.619 | 2,428 | 2. 432 | 1.889 | 1.904 | 1.968 | 1.832 | 1.877 |

[^25]TABLE 5. Percentage Distribution of Individuals' by Size of Earnings, Age and Sex, 1967


[^26]TABLE 6. Percentage Distribution of Individuals ${ }^{1}$ by Size of Earmings, Weeks Worked and Sex, 1967


See footnote 1. Table 4.
Individuals who worked $50-52$ weeks in 1967.

TABLE 7. Percentage Distribution of Individuals ${ }^{1}$ by Size of Earnings, Immigration Status and Sex, 1967


[^27]TABIE: 8. Average and Median Famings of Individuals by Immigration Status, Age and sex, 1967

|  | All age groups | A: |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 24 years and under | $\begin{aligned} & 25-34 \\ & \text { years } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 35-44 \\ & \text { years } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 45-54 \\ \text { years } \end{gathered}$ | 55-64 yerrs | 65 years and over |
|  | Malo dollars |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Canadian born | 5. 242 | 2. 468 | 5,969 | 6. 550 | 6. 361 | 5,601 | 3,238 |
| Pre-war immistants | 5.732 |  | 8. 304 | 7. 501 | 7. 564 | 5,503 | 3,974 |
| Post-war immisrants | 5,810 | 2,854 | 5, 147 | 6,682 | 6. 752 | 6,201 | 3,934 |
| Median earnings: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Canadian born | 4,932 | $\frac{1}{2}, 921$ | 5. 679 | 6. 074 | 5. 550 | 4.822 | 2, 368 |
| Pre-wat immigrants Post-war immigrants | 5,052 |  | 6,313 5,705 | 6,211 6,248 | 6, 2338 | 5,116 | 2,764 |
| Female |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average earnings : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Canadlan born | 2,416 | 1, 826 | 2,805 | 2,690 | 2. 853 | 2,985 | 2,091 |
| Prewar Immiprants. | 2,564 |  | 3, 054 | 2,565 | 3, 025 | 2,407 | 1,831 |
| Post-war immigrants | 2,474 | 1.893 | 2,599 | 2,584 |  |  |  |
| Median eamings |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Canadian horn | 2,120 2,276 | $\frac{1}{2} .400$ | 2,689 1,865 | 2,426 2,099 | 2.598 2,812 | 2,714 2,263 | 1. 572 |
| Post-war !mmizrants | 2,315 | 1.524 | 2,368 | 2,613 | 2,722 | 2.279 | - 264 |

${ }_{2}^{1}$ See footnote 1, Table 4.
${ }^{2}$ Sample too small for rellable estimates.

TABLE 9. Percentage Distribution of Individuals ${ }^{1}$ by Size of Earnings, Occupation ${ }^{2}$ and Sex, 1967


[^28]TABLE 10. Percentage Distribution of Individuals ${ }^{2}$ by Size of Wages and Salaries, Employment Status and Sex, 1967

| Wages and salaries group | Total |  | Employment status? |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Employee |  | Other |  |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |
|  | per cent |  |  |  |  |  |
| Under \$500 ..................................................................... | 5.4 | 17.6 | 2.5 | 9.9 | 22.2 | 42.7 |
| \$ 500-\$ 999 | 5.0 | 11.8 | 3.1 | 8.9 | 16.0 | 21.1 |
| 1,000-1.499 | 3.8 | 9.2 | 2.7 | 8.8 | 10.5 | 10.8 |
| $1.500-1.999$ | 3.6 | 7.4 | 2.7 | 7.5 | 8.5 | 6.8 |
| 2,000-2,499 ............................................................. | 3.6 | 8.4 | 3.2 | 9.4 | 5.9 | 5.2 |
| $2.500-2.999$ | 3.8 | 8.0 | 3.7 | 9.2 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| $3,000-3,499$ | 4.5 | 8.7 | 4.5 | 10.6 | 4.3 | 2.4 |
| 3.500-3.999 ........................................................... | 5.4 | 7.9 | 5.8 | 9.8 | 3.1 | 1.7 |
| 4,000-4,499 ........................................................... | 6.4 | 6.1 | 7.0 | 7.6 | 2.9 | 1.4 |
| $4,500-4.999$ | 6.7 | 4.6 | 7.4 | 5.7 | 2.5 | 1.1 |
| 5,000-5,499 .............................................................. | 8.3 | 3.3 | 9.2 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 1.1 |
| $5,500=5,999$ | 7.0 | 2.2 | 7.8 | 2.7 | 1.9 | 0.5 |
| 6,000-6,999 ........................................................... | 12.6 | 2.6 | 14.1 | 3.3 | 4.3 | 0.5 |
| 7,000 - 7,999 .......................................................... | B. 4 | 1.1 | 9.4 | 1.3 | 2.5 | 0.3 |
| $8.000=9.999$ _.......................................................... | 8.4 | 0.8 | 9.3 | 0.9 |  | 0.3 |
| 10,000 and over ............................................................ | 7.2 | 0.4 | 7.6 | 0.4 | 2.9 5.3 | 0.2 |
| Totals | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100. 0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Average wages and salarles ....................................... \$ | 5.292 | 2.470 | 5.681 | 2,881 | 3,041 | 1.146 |
| Median wages and salaries .......................................... \$ | 5,107 | 2,237 | 5,401 | 2.798 | 1,575 | 673 |

[^29]${ }^{3}$ Individuals were classified by their employment status at the time of the survey which is not necessarily the same as during 1967.

## PART II - FAMILIES, UNATTACHED INDIVIDUALS

Table
11. Percentage Distribution of Families by Income Groups, Sex and Labour Force Participation of Head, 1967.
12. Percentage Distribution of Families by Income Groups, Region and Labour Force Participation of Head, 1967.
13. Percentage Distribution of Families by Income Groups and Weeks Workpd by Head, 1967.
14. Percentage Distribution of Families by Income Groups, Family Characteristics and Weeks Worked by Head, 1967.
15. Percentage Distribution of Families by Income Groups and Number of Weeks Head Unemployed, 1967.
16. Percentage Distritution of Families hy Income Groups, Number of Earners and Unemployment Experience of Head, 1967.
17. Percentage Distribution of Unattached Individuals by Income Groups, Sex and Lahour Force Participation, 1967.
18. Percentage Distribution of Unattached Individuals by Income Groups, Region and Labour Force Participation, 1967.
19. Percentage Distribution of Unattached Individuals by Income Groups and Work Experience, 1967.

TABLE 11. Percentage Distribution of Families by Income Groups, Sex and Labour Force Participation of Head, 1967

| Family income group | Labour foree participation |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All familus |  | Maie head |  | Female head |  |
|  | Participant | Nonparticipant | Papticipant | Nonparticipant | Participant | N (2nparticipant |
|  |  |  | per |  |  |  |
| Under \$1,000 | 1.3 | 5.7 | 1.2 | 4.3 | 3.7 | 8.6 |
| \$ 1,000-\$ 1,999 | 2.4 | 13.7 | 2.2 | 14.1 | 7.2 | 12.7 |
| 2,000-2,999 ........................................................... | 4.5 | 26.5 | 4.2 | 31.3 | 10.4 | 16.4 |
| $3,000-3,499$ | 2.9 | 8.5 | 2.9 | 9.1 | 4.9 | 7.4 |
| $3.500-3.999$ | 3.6 | 6.6 | 3.5 | 7.0 | 7.4 | 5.9 |
| 4,000-4,499 ........................................................... | 4.2 | 5.6 | 4.2 | 5.9 | 5.9 | 4.9 |
| $4.500-4.999$ | 4.5 | 4.1 | 4.4 | 3.8 | 5.3 | 4.8 |
| $5,000-5.499$ | 5.5 | 4.9 | 5.5 | 4.6 | 7.2 | 5.6 |
| $5.500-5.999$ | 5.8 | 3.4 | 5.8 | 3.4 | 6.5 | 3.6 |
| $6,000-6,499$ | 6.2 | 3.0 | 6.2 | 2.6 | 7.1 | 3.9 |
| 6,500-6,999. | 5.7 | 2.9 | 5.7 | 2.3 | 4.9 | 4.2 |
| $7.000-7.999$ | 11.3 | 3.4 | 11.5 | 3.2 | 7.8 | 3.9 |
| 8,000- 9,999 | 17.1 | 4.9 | 17.3 | 3.2 | 10.3 | 8.5 |
| 10,000-14,999 | 18.4 | 4.5 | 18.8 | 3.4 | 8.3 | 6.7 |
| 15,000 and over | 6.6 | 2.2 | 6.7 | 1.8 | 3.2 | 2.9 |
| Totals .. | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Estmated numbers ............................................... '000 | 3,922 | 596 | 3.775 | 403 | 147 | 193 |
| Average income ...................................................... * | 8,098 | 4,338 | 8.183 | 4,076 | 5,916 | 4.885 |
| Median income ........................................................... \$ | 7,300 | 3.240 | 7,364 | 3,015 | 5,360 | 3,914 |
| Average earnings ..................................................... \$ | 7.528 | 1,810 | 7.627 | 1.274 | 4.998 | 2,927 |
| Average transfer payments ...................................... \$ | 307 | 1,491 | 303 | 1.590 | 432 | 1,283 |
| Sample size .................................................................. | 15,636 | 2,507 | 15,022 | 1,802 | 614 | 705 |

${ }^{1}$ A tamily head is clussified as a labour force participant if he worked or looked for work at any time in 1967.

TABLE 12. Percentage Listribution of Families by Income Groups, Region and Labour Force Participation of Itead. 1967

| Family incume group | Labour force participation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Atlantic Provances |  | Quebrec |  | Ontario |  | Pralrie Provinces |  | British Columbia |  |
|  | Participant | Nonparticipant | Participant | Nonparticipant | Participant | Non participant | Participant | Nonparticipant | Participant | Nonpartlcipant |
|  |  |  |  |  | per | cent |  |  |  |  |
| Under \$1,000 | 1.6 | 5.1 | 1.0 | 4.5 | 1.0 | 7.7 | 2.3 | 5.0 | 1.0 | 4.0 |
| \$ 1,000-\$ 1.999 | 5.1 | 16.8 | 2.2 | 13.3 | 1.3 | 10.8 | 4.2 | 17.7 | 1.9 | 14.2 |
| $2,000-2.999$ | 9.0 | 28.3 | 4.6 | 24.3 | 2.8 | 23.3 | 6.0 | 29.3 | 3.4 | 35.6 |
| $3.000-3.499$ | 6.0 | 8.1 | 3.2 | 6.9 | 2.0 | 8.3 | 3.6 | 11.3 | 2.3 | 9.9 |
| $3.500-3.999$ | 6.5 | 7.5 | 4.0 | 4.9 | 2.6 | 8.0 | 4.1 | 5.1 | 3.4 | 8.2 |
| 4,000-4,499 ....................... | 6.9 | 6.9 | 5.3 | 4.5 | 3.2 | 6.5 | 3.8 | 5.4 | 3.4 | 4.8 |
| $4,500-4.999$........................ | 7.1 | 3.7 | 5.6 | 4.4 | 3.2 | 4.3 | 4.7 | 4.3 | 3.6 | 3.2 |
| $5,000-5,499$ | 7.4 | 4.3 | 5.7 | 5.4 | 5.3 | 5.6 | 5.7 | 4.3 | 4.1 | 3.2 |
| 5,500-5,999 | 6.8 | 3.6 | 6.8 | 4.1 | 5.1 | 3.9 | 6.2 | 1.9 | 4.5 | 2.4 |
| 6,000-6,499 ........................ | 7.2 | 2.2 | 6.6 | 3.3 | 6.0 | 3.0 | 6.3 | 4.0 | 5.1 | 2.0 |
| $6.500-6.999$ | 5.1 | 2.6 | 5.9 | 3.1 | 5.9 | 2.6 | 5.0 | 2.9 | 6.2 | 3.6 |
| $7,000-7,999$ | 8.7 | 3.6 | 10.6 | 4.9 | 12.2 | 3.2 | 11.4 | 2.3 | 12.0 | 1.6 |
| $8,000-9.999$....................... | 11.1 | 4.2 | 16.1 | 8.0 | 18.4 | 3.6 | 16.4 | 4.6 | 21.0 | 2.4 |
| 10,000-14,999 ....................... | 9.2 | 2.2 | 15.9 | 5.5 | 22.7 | 6.5 | 15.6 | 1.4 | 21.4 | 2.8 |
| 15,000 and over ....................... | 2.4 | 1.0 | 6.4 | 2.9 | 8.3 | 2.7 | 4.8 | 0.6 | 6.9 | 2.0 |
| Totals ............................... | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Estimated numbers ............. 000 | 325 | 66 | 1.076 | 169 | 1,466 | 196 | 663 | 98 | 392 | 67 |
| Average income ..................... \$ | 6,168 | 3,796 | 7.808 | 4.835 | 8.952 | 4.584 | 7.384 | 3,682 | 8,508 | 3,859 |
| Median income ........................ \$ | 5.558 | 2.993 | 6,923 | 3.601 | 7.950 | 3,493 | 6.809 | 2,940 | 7,924 | 2,910 |
| Average earnings .................... \$ | 5,552 | 1.512 | 7,235 | 2.603 | 8,385 | 1.725 | 6,847 | 1.324 | 7.926 | 1.054 |
| Average transfer paymunts ...... $\$$ | 455 | 1.677 | 361 | 1.450 | 259 | 1.439 | 271 | 1,477 | 280 | 1.583 |
| Ssaple size ............................... | 3.239 | 726 | 3.244 | 489 | 4,305 | 561 | 3,242 | 479 | 1,606 | 252 |

'See foatnote 1. Table 11.

TABLE 13. Percentage l) istribution of Families ${ }^{1}$ by Income Groups and Weeks Worked by Head, 1967

| Farmis income moun | Number of weeks worked by head |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 50-52 weeks | $\begin{aligned} & 40-4! \\ & \text { weths } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 30-39 \\ & \text { weeks } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20-29 \\ & \text { weeks } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 10-19 \\ \text { weeks } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 9 weeks or less |
|  | per cent |  |  |  |  |  |
| Under \$1,000. | 1.1 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 1.9 | 3.8 | 8.8 |
| \$ $1.000-\$ 1.999$ | 1.5 | 1.7 | 4.0 | 9.4 | 15.1 | 18.5 |
| $2.000-2.999$ | 2.9 | 6.1 | 10.9 | 14.8 | 17.0 | 23.2 |
| $3.000-3,499$ | 2.2 | 4.8 | 6.7 | 8.6 | 7.3 | 10.6 |
| $3,500-3,999$ | 2.7 | 7.0 | 8.2 | 9.5 | 7.4 | 10.7 |
| 4,000-4,499 | 3.6 | 5.7 | 8.6 | 9.6 | 7.9 | 5.0 |
| $4.500-4.999$ | 4.1 | 5.7 | 8.9 | 4.3 | 6.5 | 4.5 |
| $5.000-5.499$ | 5.2 | 8.0 | 7.4 | 5.7 | 6.1 | 3.7 |
| $5.500-5.999$ | 5.9 | 7.0 | 5.0 | 6.1 | 2.7 | 0.3 |
| 6,000 - 6,499 ......................................................... | 6.1 | 8.6 | 7.8 | 6.1 | 3.7 | 1.5 |
| $6.500-6.999$ | 5.9 | 6.8 | 4.9 | 3.4 | 3.3 | 1.6 |
| $7.000-7.999$ | 12.1 | 10.3 | 7.2 | 5.7 | 6.3 | 4.5 |
| $8,000-9,999$ | 18.5 | 14.5 | 9.1 | 8.6 | 6.2 | 2.0 |
| $10,000-14.999$ | 20.5 | 11.0 | 7.6 | 5.3 | 5.8 | 4.2 |
| 15.000 and over | 7.5 | 2.1 | 2.9 | 1.1 | 0.9 | 1.3 |
| Totals | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Estimated numbers ................................................ 0000 | 3,253 | 250 | 169 | 122 | 89 | 59 |
| Average Income ........................................................ s | 8.580 | 6,682 | 5.976 | 5.097 | 4.705 | 3.738 |
| Median income ........................................................... \$ | 7.726 | 6.197 | 5,127 | 4.301 | 3,958 | 2,973 |
| Averege expings ...................................................... \& | 8,079 | 6. 120 | 5.183 | 4.047 | 3.520 | 1.758 |
| Average transfer payments .......................................... \$ | 253 | 367 | 497 | 702 | 650 | 1.279 |
| Sample stze .................................................................. | 12.726 | 1.030 | 751 | 568 | 305 | 256 |

${ }^{2}$ This table excludes all families whose head was not in the labour force at any time in 1967.

TABLI: 14. Percentage Distribution of Families ${ }^{1}$ by Income Groups. Family Characteristics and Weeks, Horked by Head, 1967

| Famliy income group | Weeks worked by head |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Married couples only |  | Married couples with single children only |  | All other married couples |  | Single parent with single children only |  | All other fumilies |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 50-52 \\ & \text { weeks } \end{aligned}$ | 49 weeks or less | $50-52$ weeks | 49 weeks or less | 50-52 <br> weeks | 49 weeks or less | $50-52$ weeks | 49 weeks or less | $\begin{aligned} & 50-52 \\ & \text { Weekis } \end{aligned}$ | 49 weeks or less |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | ent |  |  |  |  |
| Under \$1.000 | 1.6 | 2. 1 | 1.0 | 1.4 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 1.9 | 9.0 | 1.2 | 0.9 |
| \$ 1.000-\$1.999 | 2.1 | 9.9 | 1.2 | 4.6 | 0.8 | 3.4 | 5.5 | 15.7 | 4.9 | 5.9 |
| $2.000-2,999$ | 4.2 | 13.3 | 2.6 | 10.3 | 1.0 | 4.2 | 5.9 | 24.8 | 5.9 | 12.2 |
| 3,000-3,499 | 2.4 | 8.5 | 2.0 | 6.6 | 1.3 | 2.2 | 5.3 | 7.8 | 3.1 | 2.9 |
| $3.500-3,999$ | 3.2 | 8.8 | 2.5 | 8.4 | 1.3 | 1.9 | 8.0 | 4.8 | 3.1 | 13.6 |
| $4.000-4.499$ | 4.0 | 6.6 | 3.5 | 7.9 | 2. 2 | 8.1 | 6.2 | 3.9 | 4.9 | 6.1 |
| $4.500 \cdot 4.999$ | 3.9 | 6.5 | 4.2 | 6.6 | 2.3 | 4.5 | 7.3 | 5.7 | 3.6 | 2.8 |
| $5.000-5.499$ | 5.7 | 6.2 | 5.2 | 7.9 | 2.4 | 5.1 | 7.6 | 4.5 | 9.0 | 2.3 |
| $5.500 \cdot 5.999$ | 5.7 | 5.0 | 6.1 | 5.3 | 3.6 | 5.9 | 8.4 | 3.6 | 4.8 | 7.8 |
| $6.000-6.499$ | 5.3 | 6.3 | 6.5 | 7.4 | 3.0 | 3.8 | 8.1 | 6. 0 | 6.0 | 7.2 |
| 6,500-6,999 | 5.4 | 4.2 | 6.3 | 5.4 | 3.3 | 5.0 | 4.5 | 4.6 | 6.2 | 1.7 |
| $7.000-7.999$ | 11.2 | 6.9 | 12.8 | 8.0 | 9.8 | 10.3 | 7.9 | 5.1 | 7.6 | 9.3 |
| $8,000-9.999$ | 18.4 | 7.7 | 18.9 | 10.8 | 18.7 | 18.2 | 11.2 | 3.6 | 14.7 | 11.2 |
| 10.000-14.999 | 20.7 | 7.0 | 19.8 | 7.4 | 35.5 | 18.8 | 8.9 | 0.9 | 16.1 | 15.3 |
| 15,000 and over | 6.1 | 1.0 | 7.4 | 1.9 | 14.4 | 7.9 | 3.4 |  | 9.1 | 0.7 |
| Totuls | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Estimated numbers ........... '000 | 595 | 170 | 2,299 | 393 | 201 | 43 | 94 | 37 | 64 | 26 |
| Averate Income ..................... 3 | 8.292 | 5,190 | 8.573 | 5,866 | 10.766 | 8.382 | 6,351 | 3.730 | 7. 920 | B. 120 |
| Median income ...................... | 7.579 | 4. 560 | 7. 694 | 5,265 | 8. 988 | 7. 504 | 5. 636 | 3, 031 | 6. 781 | 5,711 |
| Average earnings ................... 3 | 7.756 | 4. 261 | 8. 150 | 5,145 | 9,658 | 6, 584 | 5,816 | 2,567 | 6. 884 | 4. 598 |
| Average transfer payments ..... | 99 | 400 | 240 | 547 | 775 | 118 | 220 | 690 | 551 | 862 |
| Smmple size …….................... | 2,301 | 704 | 8,956 | 1.737 | 814 | 207 | 392 | 156 | 263 | 106 |

${ }^{3}$ See footnote 1. Table 13.

TABLE 15. Percentage Distribution of Families ${ }^{1}$ by Income Groups and Number of Weeks Head Inemployed, 1967

${ }^{1}$ See footnote 1 , Table 13.

TABLE 16. Percentage Distribution of Families ${ }^{1}$ by Income Groups, Number of Earners and Linemployment Experience of Ilead, 1967

${ }^{1}$ See footnote 1, Table 13.

TABLE 17. Percentage Distribution of Unattached Individuals by Income Groups, Sex and Labour Force Participation, 1967

${ }^{1}$ An unattached individuai is classified as a labour force participant if he or she worked or looked for work any time in 1967.

TABLE 18. Percentage Distribution of Unattached Individuals by Income Groups, Region and Labour Force Participation, ${ }^{2}$ I967

| Incame group | Labour force participation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Atlantic Provinces |  | Quebec |  | Ontarlo |  | Pralrie Provinces |  | British Columbia |  |
|  | Participant | Nonparticipant | Participant | Nonparticipant | Participant | Nonparticipant | Participant | Nonparticipant | Participant | Nonparticipant |
| Under \$1,000 | 17.8 | 24.2 | 18.5 | 32.4 | $8.0 \mid 22.3$ |  | 12.1 | 25.4 | 10.1 | 22.3 |
| \$ 1,000-\$1.499 | 12.8 | 47.4 | 5.5 | 46.5 | 7.1 39.1 |  | 8.3 | 41.9 | 6.8 | 41.0 |
| 1,500-1,999 | 10.1 | 11.6 | 5.8 | 10.1 | 5.8 | 14.0 | 8.0 | 13.2 | 7.2 | 17.9 |
| 2,000-2.499 | 8.6 | 6.2 | 6.1 | 2.9 | 5.2 | 8.1 | 8.4 | 6.3 | 3.6 | 6.6 |
| 2.500-2.999 | 7.5 | 3.0 | 6.8 | 2.5 | 5.3 | 3.5 | 6.9 | 2.7 | 6.3 | 4.0 |
| $3,000-3,498$ | 9.3 | 1.1 | 8.8 | 1.7 | 6.3 | 4.0 | 8.8 | 1.9 | 8.7 | 3.8 |
| $3,500-3,999$ | 8.3 | 2.3 | 10.0 | 1.0 | 8.6 | 4.1 | 7.5 | 2.0 | 8.2 | 2.0 |
| 4,000-4,999 | 10.4 | 2.4 | 12.7 | 1.4 | 1 E .2 | 2.6 | 12.8 | 2.9 | 11.8 | 1.2 |
| $5,000-5,999$ | 5.2 | 0.5 | 10.2 | -- | 13.0 | 1.4 | 10.6 | 1.4 | 12.4 | 0.8 |
| $6,000-6.999$ | 3.1 | 0.4 | 6.0 | 1.2 | 10.4 | 0.9 | 7.4 | 0.7 | 12.0 | .- |
| $7,000-7,999$ | 1.6 | 0.3 | 3.3 | 0.4 | 5.1 | 0.5 | 3.0 | 0.5 | 5.2 | - |
| 8,000-9,999 | 3.2 | 0.5 | 3.7 |  | 5.4 | 0.4 | 3.6 | -- | 5.0 | -- |
| 10,000 and over | 2.0 |  | 2.6 |  |  | 1.1 |  | 1.2 | 2.7 | 0.4 |
| Totals | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  | $\checkmark 100.0$ | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Estimated numbers ........... '000 | 78 | 44 | 283 | 102 | 373 | 156 | 195 | 81 | 117 | 72 |
| Average income ..................... * | 3,024 | 1.496 | 3,621 | 1,353 | 4,438 | 1,8251,353 | 3.749 | 1.673 | 4.291 | 1.592 |
| Median income ........................ | 2,546 | 1.271 | 3.414 | 1.188 | 4,334 |  | 3.357 | 1.293 | 3,944 | 1,337 |
| Average eamings .................... * | 2. 772 | - . | 3,422 | .. | 4. 164 | $883$ | 3.470 | $\cdots$ | 3,916 | 1.025 |
| Average transfer payments ...... \$ | 128 | 949 | 62 | 842227 | 73 |  | 90 | 912 | 148 |  |
| Sumple stze ............................. | 448 | 284 | 509 |  | 700 | 414 | 650 | 360 | 324 | 219 |

[^30]TABLE 19. Percentage Distribution of Unattached Individuals by Income Groups and Work Experience, ${ }^{2} 1967$

|  | Income group | Weeks worked |  | Weeks unemployed |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $50-52$ weeks | 49 weeks or less | None | Some |
|  |  | per cent |  |  |  |
| Under \$1,000 |  | 8.1 | 23.0 | 11.1 | 21.4 |
| \$ 1,000-\$1,499 | .... | 4.1 | 14.8 | 6.5 | 11.8 |
| 1,500-1,999. | ..... | 4.0 | 12.9 | 5.8 | 11.6 |
| 2,000-2,499. | .... | 4.7 | 9.5 | 5.2 | 11.3 |
| $2,500-2,999$ |  | 5.4 | 8.3 | 5.9 | 8.5 |
| 3,000-3,499. | ... | 8.2 | 7.2 | 7.4 | 10.7 |
| 3,500-3.999 |  | 9.2 | 5.3 | 8.6 | 4.5 |
| 4,000-4,999. |  | 17.5 | 7.2 | 15.5 | 7.8 |
| 5,000-5,989. |  | 13.6 | 5.6 | 12.2 | 5.6 |
| 6,000-6,999. |  | 10.8 | 2.4 | 9.1 | 3.2 |
| $7,000-7,999$ |  | 4.9 | $1.9$ | 4.3 | 1.8 |
| $8,000-9,999$. |  | 5.6 | 1.7 | 4.9 | 1.3 |
| 10,000 and over |  | 4.0 | 0.1 | 3.3 | 0.4 |
| Totals |  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Estimated numbers | -000 | 732 | 314 | 893 | 153 |
| Average income. | ..... \$ | 4,608 | 2.473 | 4, 197 | 2,625 |
| Median income | ..... | 4. 370 | 1.972 | 3,970 | 2.229 |
| Average eamings | .... \$ | 4.394 | 2,093 | 3.933 | 2,359 |
| Average transfer payments | .... \$ | 52 | 165 | 72 | 168 |
| Sample size |  | 1, 823 | 808 | 2,253 | 378 |

${ }^{1}$ This table excludes unattached individuals who were not in the labour force at any time in 1967.

## TECHNICAL NOTES AND EXPLANATIONS

## Data Sources

## The Sample

The Survey of Consumer Finances used five sixths of the April 1968 Labour Force Survey sample - only households surveyed for the first month in the Labour Force Survey were not included in the Survey of Consumer Finances. For a detailed description of the sample design see DBS Catalogue No. 71-504, Canadian Labour Force Survey, Methodo$\log y$.

Of the 31,887 households selected 3,002 were vacant and 2,954 could not be contacted or were not interviewed for other reasons; among them were some refusals for any information at all. From the remaining 25.931 households sometimes only data on the general characteristics of the household occupants was collected; in other cases Labour Force Survey schedules were completed but income data was refused or not fully reported. However, from 37,985 individual income recipients aged 14 years and over satisfactory data were collected; these aggregate into 22,641 family unit records (families or unattached individuals). ${ }^{1}$ In the present report, tables in Part I are hased on reporting from approximately 21,000 male and 10.500 female earners. Tables in Part II utilize either the 18,143 family records or the 4,135 complete schedules returned by unattached individuals.

Tables in Part Il specify the sample size for each tabulation shown. Because of technical problems in tabulating the individual data, it was impossible to provide this information for tables in Part I. However, some information about sample size in individual tabulations has been provided below in the discussion on Reliability of Estimates.

## Data Collection

The enumeration procedures used in this survey were largely the same as those used in past income surveys. Information for all household members was listed on control cards. For all persons 14 years of age and over the enumerator completed a Labour Force Survey schedule. Then an income questionnaire was left for each household member who had received income during the year. The enumerator later picked up the completed income questionnaires. So the data utilized in this report was partially obtained by interview (Household Record

[^31]Card, Labour Force Schedule) and partially by self-enumeration (Income Questionnaire).

Of the five rotation groups of households that were used in the Survey of Consumer Finances, four were in the Labour Force survey sample in Fehruary 1968 and answered questions about their immigration status. So for approximately 70 per cent of the sample this piece of information was successfully linked with the other data in the survey. A separate weighting scheme was used to produce national estimates but it should he noted that tahles by immigration status are based on a smaller sample than the rest of the estimates.

The questionnaires used to collect data for the current report are reproduced at the end of the publication. See pp 42 to 45.

## Coverage

Excent for the Yukon and Northwest Territories, the Labour Force Survey sample covers all private households in Canada. The "private household" stipulation excludes from the coverage, individuals residing in institutions, ${ }^{2}$ on Indian reservations or in military camps. In addition, the Survey of Consumer Finances removes from its tabulations all records of individuals or families whose income comes mainly from military pay and allowances. Because of these exclusions, the tabulations in the present report should be considered to deal with the civilian labour force residing in the ten pro$v$ inces.

It should be noted that earlier income surveys were limited to non-farm families, and individuals. The income-work history data for 1961 exctuded individuals who received at least half of their income from farming. Also, families containing at least one such individual were excluded. Data in the present report cover the farm as well as the non-farm population.

Apart from this general description of the survey coverage, it should be noted that tables in Part I and in the Appendix often cover a somew hat different universe, depending on the purposes of the table. The following table explains the main differences in coverage.

[^32]Statement I. Coverage of Individuals in Various Tables


[^33]Tables B and C in the Appendix deal with:

|  | Part-year labour force participants | Nonparticipants |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | '000 |  |
| Male | 826 | 1. 293 |
| Female | 1,070 | 4,267 |
| Totals | 1.896 | 5,560 |

Also Table 9 and 10 cover a special universe:

|  | Male | Female | Total | Reference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | '000 |  |  |  |
| Earners currently in the labour force (Apr. "68) excluding new seekers | 5,114 | 2, 059 | 7. 173 | Table 9 |
| Persons reporting wages and salaries | 5,044 | 2,600 | 7,644 | Table 10 |

## Response Rate

The 28,885 occupied households contained 31,045 family units. Of these family units 21,639 non-farm and 1,002 farm family units provided complete income information which constitutes a 72.9 per cent response rate. Another 1,001 family units supplied partial information; these records were not used in the family series but at least one individual in each partial unit provided usable income information and the response rate on an individual hasis was 82.4 per cent. The remaining 7,403 family units either refused to complete the questionnaire, were unahle to supply the information of simply could not be contacted by the enumerators.

## Reliability of Estimates

For a fuller discussion of the reliahility of the estimates the reader is referred to pp. 67-70 in DBS Catalogue No. 13-534 Income Distributions by Size in Canada, 1967.

## Sampling Error

As a rough guide to evaluating sampling errors of percentages, our past experience indicates that errors for percentages derived from a stratified clustered sample such as the one used for the Survey of Consumer Finances, are up to twice as large as those for a simple random sample of the same size. Thus the formula $s=2 \sqrt{\frac{P Q}{n}}$ should be used to calculate the approximate sampling error where $s=$ estimated standard error of percentage (expressed in percentage points), $P=$ percentage of the population with a given characteristic, $Q=100-P$, and $n=$ sample size. Statement $A$ on page 69 of the main report (DBS Catalogue No. 13-534) contains a table where values of $s$ have been calculated for selected sample sizes ( $n$ ranging from 100 to 20,000 ) and selected values of $P$.

For example, referring to Tahle 14 page 31 we see that 9.9 per cent of all married couples where the head worked 49 weeks or less in 1967 had a family income of $\$ 1,000-\$ 1,999$. This estimate is hased on a sample of 704 families. Using the above formula $s=2 \sqrt{\frac{9.9 \times 90.1}{704}}=2.25$ per cent; from this we can state with 68 per cent confidence that the true value of P lies between $9.9 \pm 2.3$ or between 7.6 per cent and 12.2 per cent. The corresponding 95 per cent confidence interval will range hetween $9.9 \pm(2 \times 2.25)$ or 5.4 per cent and 14.4 per cent. Statement A from the main puhlication would have
given us as an approximation the reading $s=2.2$ per cent.

Tables in Part II give at the hottom of each column the sample size n and permit the reader to estimate the reliahility of the statistics in the ahove manner. For tahles in Part I this procedure was not possible for technical reasons and as a partial suhstitute we present helow the sample size in
respect to individual earners and lahour force participants for the most important hasic characteristics. It should he noted that the distribution of the original sample by various characteristics will differ from the distribution of the weighted estimates hecause of differential weighting factors. The sample size figures are presented here solely for the purpose of evaluating the reliahility of estimates.

Statement II. Sample Size for Individuals

|  | Male | Female |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Distribution of iabour force participants in original sample by sex |  |
| All labour force participants ${ }^{1}$ | 20,915 | 10,526 |
| By relatlonship to head of family (Table 1): |  |  |
| Head <br> Wife | 16,536 | 2,002 5,764 |
| Son or daughter under 20 years ${ }^{2}$ <br> Son or daughter 20 years and over ${ }^{2}$ | 1. 8.843 | 1,350 1,081 |
| daughter 20 years and over | 2. 100 | 1.081 329 |
| By age (Table 2): |  |  |
| 24 years and under 25-34 years $\qquad$ | 4,505 4,516 | 3,764 2,061 |
| $35-44$ $45-54$ "1 | 4,600 | 1,804 |
| $\begin{array}{ll}\text { 55-64 } \\ 65+ & \text { O. }\end{array}$ | 3,831 2,599 | $\begin{array}{r}1.742 \\ \\ \hline 124\end{array}$ |
|  |  |  |
|  | Distribution of earners in original sample by sex |  |
| All eamers ${ }^{3}$ | 21,018 | 10,614 |
| By province (Table 4): |  |  |
| Newfoundland $\qquad$ <br> Prince Edward 1siand | 1.158 | 485 |
| Nova Scotia ............. | 1,988 | 1,097 |
| New Brunswick Quebec | 1,553 | 853 |
| Manitoba | 1,340 1,310 | $\begin{array}{r}2.686 \\ \hline 83\end{array}$ |
| Saskatchewan | 1,131 | 509 |
| Alberta | 1,957 | 1,179 |
| British Columbia | 2,082 | 1,159 |
| By age (Table 5): |  |  |
| 24 years and under 25-34 years | 4,554 4,505 | 3.821 |
| $35-44$ | 4,573 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 45-54 \\ & 55-64 \end{aligned}$ | 3, 818 | 1. 729 |
| $65+$ | $\begin{array}{r}2.592 \\ \hline 976\end{array}$ | 940 215 |
| By work experience: 50-52 weeks worked: |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Full-time $\qquad$ <br> Part-time | 14,378 | 4,616 |
| Part-time .......................................................................................1-49 weeks worked: |  |  |
| Full-time ............. | 4,737 | 2,992 |
| Part-time ............ | 888 | 1,681 |
| Zero weeks worked ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 317 | - 305 |

[^34]It should be noted that the three tables in the Appendix were run from a special tape, that includes data on all persons aged 14 years and over in sample households regardless of whether they received
money income in 1967 or not - except non-respondents. These estimates were hased on the following sample counts.

Statement III. Distribution of Original Sample by Labour Force Participation in 1967, by Age and Sex


Technical difficulties have prevented us from estimating the standard error of average earnings and average income presented in this report. Some idea about the reliability of these statistics can be formed by examining the underlying sample size and by referring back to the main report where similar tables have been presented for total income of individuals (rather than earnings) and income of all families and unattached individuals - with estimated standard errors of average income shown. For example, in order to get an idea about the sampling error attaching to the estimate of average earnings by age and sex (see Table 5, page 25 ) the reader is referred to Table 38 in the main report (Catalogue No. 13-534). Except for the 65 ycars and over age group the average earnings and average total income are very close and standard efror of average
income published in Table 38 is a good guide for "guessing" the standard error of average earnings in Table 5. Unfortunately, only some tables in the present report have parallel tables containing error estimates in the main report.

The complex sampling scheme makes the estimation of sampling errors very cumbersome and expensive.

## Methods of Estimation

A detailed description of how the sample returns were weighted to obtain the published estimates can be found on pp. 70-71 in the main report (DBS Catalogue No. 13-534).

## APPENDIX

Table
A. Lahour Force Participation in 1967 of Individuals Aged 14 Years and Over, hy Age and Sex.
B. Percentage Distribution of Individuals with less than Full-year Lahour Force Participation in 1967 hy Main Reason for not heing in the Lahour Force, by Age and Sex.
C. Average Income of Individuals with less than Full-year Lahour Force Participation in 1967 by Age and Sex.

TABLE A. Labour Force Participation in 1967 of Individuals Aged 14 Years and Over, by Age and Sex

|  | Age |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { All } \\ & \text { ages } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 24 years and undet | $\begin{gathered} 25-44 \\ \text { years } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 45-64 \\ \text { years } \end{gathered}$ | 65 years and over |  |
|  | estimated numbers '000 |  |  |  |  |
| Males: |  |  |  |  |  |
| In the labour force all year ${ }^{2}$ | 742 | 2,372 | 1,614 | 167 | 4,896 |
| In the labour force part of the $\mathrm{year}^{2}$ | 522 | 142 | 105 | 58 | 826 |
| Not in labour force ${ }^{3}$ | 670 | 40 | 114 | 469 | 1,293 |
| Totals | 1,934 | 2,554 | 1,833 | 694 | 7.015 |
| Females: |  |  |  |  |  |
| In the labour force all year ${ }^{2}$ | 523 | 700 | 553 | 39 | 1,815 |
| In the [abour force part of the year ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 489 | 379 | 180 | 22 | 1,070 |
| Not in labour force ${ }^{\text {3 }}$ | 955 | 1,457 | 1,120 | 735 | 4,267 |
| Totals | 1.967 | 2,536 | 1.853 | 796 | 7,152 |
| Both: |  |  |  |  |  |
| In the labour force all year ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 1,265 | 3,072 | 2. 167 | 206 | 6,711 |
| In the labour force part of the year ${ }^{3}$ | 1,011 | 521 | 285 | 79 | 1,896 |
| Not in labour force ${ }^{3}$ | 1,625 | 1.497 | I, 234 | 1,205 | 5,560 |
| Totals ............. | 3, 901 | 5.090 | 3,686 | 1, 490 | 14, 16\% |

${ }^{1}$ Individuals who were in the labour force $50-52$ weeks during 1967, i.e, those for whom total of weeks in which they worked and weeks in which they were without work and looked for work adds to 50-52.
${ }^{\text {² }}$ Individuals who were in the labour force 1-49 weeks in 1967.

- Individuals who neither worked nor looked for work in 1967.

TABLE. B. Percentage Distribution of Individuals with less than Full-year Labour Force Participation in 19671 by Main Reason for not being in Labour Force, by Age and Sex

| Main reason for not being in labour force | $\begin{gathered} \text { All } \\ \text { ages } \end{gathered}$ | Age |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 24 years and under | $\begin{aligned} & 25-14 \\ & \text { years } \end{aligned}$ | $45-64$ years | 65 years and over |
|  |  |  | per cent |  |  |
| Males with 1-49 weeks of labour force participation: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Permanently unable to work | 2. 3 | 0.1 | 2.7 | 10.9 | 5.9 |
| Keeping house | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.7 | 1.0 | 1. 3 |
| Going to school | 64.4 | 92.7 | 30.6 | 2.3 | -- |
| Retired on voluntarily idle | 21.9 | 4.3 | 32.2 | 60.3 | 87.6 |
| Other | 11.0 | 2.8 | 33.7 | 25.5 | 5.2 |
| Totals | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Males with no labour force participation: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Permanently unable to work. | 12.3 | 1.1 | 52.7 | 55.4 | 14.3 |
| Keeping house | 0.6 | 0.4 | 1.1 | 0.6 | 0.9 |
| Going ta school | 51.0 | 96.9 | 25.0 | 0.7 | -- |
| Retired or valuntarily idle | 35.0 | 0.9 | 11.6 | 38.6 | 84.7 |
| Other | 1.1 | 0.7 | 9.7 | 4.7 | 0.1 |
| Totals | 100.0 | 100. 0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Females with 1-49 weeks of labour force participation: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Permanently unable to work | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 1.0 |
| Keeping house | 61.3 | 27.7 | 90.7 | 88.5 | 76.2 |
| Going to school | 31.6 | 66.2 | 3.2 | 1.4 | -- |
| Retired or voluntarily idle | 3.7 | 3.8 | 2.4 | 4.8 | 18. 1 |
| Other | 3.1 | 2.1 | 3.5 | 4.9 | 4.8 |
| Totals | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Females with no iabour force participation: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Permanenlly unable to work | 1.6 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 1.2 | 5. 1 |
| Keeping house ..................................... | 79.0 | 25.9 | 98.7 | 97.5 | 80.8 |
| Going to school | 16.4 | 72.5 | 0.4 | 0.2 | -- |
| Retlred of voluntarily idle | 2.9 | 0.6 | 0.1 | 1.1 | 14.0 |
| Other | 0.1 | 0.2 |  | 0.1 |  |
| Totals | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

[^35]TABLE C. Average Income of Individuals with less than Full-year Labour Force Participation in $1967^{1}$ by Age and Sex

|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { All } \\ \text { ages } \end{gathered}$ | Age |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 24 years and under | $\begin{aligned} & 25-49 \\ & \text { years } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 45-64 \\ & \text { years } \end{aligned}$ | 65 years and over |
| Males with 1.49 weeks of labour force participation: |  |  |  |  |  |
| income recipients us proportion of part-year participants ${ }^{3}$................ \% | 93.5 | 90.1 | 98.7 | 99.3 | 100.0 |
| Average income per reciplent ........................................................... \$ | 2,240 | 1.157 | 4. 222 | 4,009 | 3.629 |
| Eamers as proportion of part-year participants ${ }^{2}$.............................. \% | 91.7 | 89.6 | 97.3 | 96.5 | 87.1 |
| Average earnings per earner ............................................................ \$ | 1,894 | 1.092 | 3.699 | 3.237 | 1.938 |
| Reciplents of transfer payments as proportion of part-year participants ${ }^{4}$ $\qquad$ | 27.5 | 6.5 | 65.9 | 51.9 | 74.0 |
| Average transler payments per recipient ........................................ \& | 174 | 28 | 385 | 326 | 680 |
| Mabes with no labour force participation: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Income recipients as proportion of non-particlpants ......................... \% | 47.2 | 4.2 | 65.3 | 85.4 | 98.1 |
| Average income per reciplent .......................................................... \$ | 1,006 | 37 | 1.344 | 2,055 | 2.114 |
| Reciplents of transfer payments as proportion of non-participants \% | 40.4 | 0.6 | 56.4 | 58.8 | 91.8 |
| Average transfer payments per reciplent ......................................... \$ | 489 | 3 | 954 | 809 | 1.070 |
| Femajes with 1-49 weeks of labour force paplicipation: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Income reciptents as proportion of part-year participants* ................ \% | 90.6 | 91.4 | 89.4 | 90.1 | 97.2 |
| Average income per rectplent .......................................................... \$ | 1,196 | 934 | 1,394 | 1.387 | 2. 119 |
| Earners as proportion of part-year participants ${ }^{2}$............................... \% | 88.7 | 90.9 | 88.1 | 85.4 | 77.8 |
| Average earnings per eamer ............................................................ \$ | 1.076 | 907 | 1.297 | 1.115 | 796 |
| Recipients of transfer payments as proportion of part-year participants ${ }^{2}$ $\qquad$ | 8.8 | 4. 4 | 8.8 | 15.1 | 52.7 |
| Average transfer payments per reciplent ............................................ | 48 | 16 | 40 | 85 | 562 |
| Females with no labour force participation: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Income reclplents as proportion of non-participants ......................... \% | 21.7 | 4.1 | 6.1 | 15.7 | 85.5 |
| Average income per reciplent ........................................................... \$ | 301 | 21 | 78 | 222 | 1.247 |
| Reclpients of transfer payments as proportion of non-participants \% | 17.0 | 0.9 | 3.0 | 7.3 | 81.2 |
| Average transfer payments per reciplent ............................................ \$ | 186 | 6 | 44 | 72 | 882 |

[^36]Name of respondent:

CF 2

## DOMINION BUREAU OF STATISTICS <br> Ortawn, Canada

1967 INCOME QUESTIONNAIRE
(To be completed by persons 14 years of age and over who recelved income in 1967)


COMFIDENTIAL - All infomation will be treated as confidential and used only by the Dominion Bureau of Seatistica for atatiatical purposes, Please refer to the guide on reverse side if necessary.
PART 1 - During the iwel ve months ending December 31, 1967, whot was your income from the following sources:

1. WAGES AND SALARIES BEFORE DEDUCTIONS
2. MILITARY PAY AND ALLOWANCES
3. NET INCOME FROM NON-FARM SELF-EMPLOYMENT -- unincorporated business, professional practice, and other self-employment. (In the case of a partnership, report your shore of net income only.) Note: Alse complete Port II ......
4. NFTINCOME FROM FARM SELF-EMPLOYMENT* (In the case of a partnership, report your shore of net income only.) MOTE: Also complete Port II...
5. GROSS INCOME FROM ROOMERS AND BOARDERS
6. INTEREST (on boads or deposits), DIVIDENISS
7. OTHER INCOME EROM INVESTMENTS* - nCt sents, interest from morigage envesiment, income from estate or trust funds, eec.
8. FAWILY AND YOUTH ALI.OWANCFS - Federal and Provincial \{Quebec - Family and Schooling allowences). To be reported by the father or the guardian..
?. OED AGE PENSIONS - ofd age security, paymenrs received under Gumanaeed Income Supplemenr Plan, oldage assist ance and pensions received under Canada Pension Plan and Quebec Pension Pian
9. UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE BENEFITS
10. OTHER INCOME FROM GOVERNMENT SOURCES - all other sacial assisunce andmllowance payments not reported already in Questions 8 to 10 .
11. RETIREMENT PENSIONS, SUPERANNUATION AND ANNUITIES
12. OTHER WONEY INCOME - income from abroed (show equivalent in Canadian dollars), alimony, non-fefundable scho larships, erc.

Specify:
14. TOTAL INCOME - sum of entries in Questions 1 to 13

|  | Dollara | 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 04 |  |  |
| 03 |  |  |
| $\frac{1}{03}$ |  |  |
| - |  |  |
| 05 |  |  |
| 0 |  |  |
| 00 |  |  |
| 0 |  |  |
| $\infty$ |  |  |
| 10 |  |  |
| 4 |  |  |
| 42 |  |  |
| 11 |  |  |
| 14 |  |  |

PART 11 - To be completed by persors who reported NET INCOME from form ond nen-fom self-employmont (Questions 3 and 4)


[^37]REMARKS:

## GUIDE TO INCOME SURVEY QUESTIOMS

PART I, This part should be completed by all persone 14 yeme of oge and over who received inceme in 1967,

1. FAGES and SALARIES. Report total cash wages and salaries before wll deducrions, wuch as, income emx, pension fund contributions, etc. Earnings of newapaper boys, cleaning women and baby siters whould be reporeed here.
2. MILITARY PAY * ALLOFANCES, Show here any pay received an a regular member of the armed forces or as a member of in reserve unit.
3. NET INCOME FROM NON-FARM SELF-EMPLOYMENT

- and -
T. NFT INCOME FROM FAARU SELF-EMPR OYMENT. Any person who had income from either of the above sources is asked firsa to com plexe PART II of the Questionnaire. See instructions given for PART If at the end of this Guide.

5. GROSS INCOME from ROOHERS \& BOARDERS. Etclude pmyments seceived from relativen.
6. INTEREST (on BONDS or DEPOSITS), DIVIDENDS. Report interest received on deposirs in banks, credis unions, erust companies, elc. insurance policies should be reporred in Question ${ }^{\circ}$.
7. OTHER JNCOME FROM INVESTMENTS. Report net senes from real estase (including rentel received with respect to farm lamd), all moft. ege incerest, reguler income from on estute of rrust hand, interese from losns, etc.
8. FAMILY YOUTH ALLOWANCES. Allownices received under the rederal and provincial (Queber - Family and Schooling Aliowancea) peopeoss should be reported by the Gather or guardian of the children. mother.
9. OLD AGE PENSIONS. Pensions and assisrance received under Old Age Security, Guaranteed lacome Supplement snd Old Age Assistance plans, as mell as pensions under CANADA and QUEBEC Pension
10. UNEMPLOYMENT INSURASCE BENFFITS. Report here the smount of benefirs received under the Uinemployment Inaurance Acr.
11. OTHER INCOME FROW GOVERNMENT SOURCES

Include here:
-workmen"s compensation, training allowances;

- vererans pensions and willowances and pensions to widows and dependen $s$ of veterans:
- social assistance and socisl sllowances, such as, mother's allow. ances, pensions to the blind and disabled, cash relief payments.
efc.

12. RETIREMENT PENSIONS, SUPERANNUATION \& ANNCITIES Report:

- income which was received as the result of having been a member of a pension plan ol one of more employers; pensions poid to widows of other relatives of deceased pensioners;
-pensions ofretired civilaervanes, military personmel and $\mathbb{R} . C$. M.P. officers;
-annuity payments received from Canadian Governmena Annuitief Fund, an insurance company, eec.
Note: Pensions from abroud should be entered in Question 13

13. OTHER MONEY INCOME. Finier and identily here any other mnney income not reported in questions 1 to 12 , Euch als, alimony, royel. income not reported in quesions ito
ties, non-refundeble scholarships, eec.

Note: Following cash receipis should not be efported: wale of property, tetlements of insurance policies and inherimacea received in
lump sum, capital and gambling gains or loses, income tas and pension fund refunds.
14. TOTAL INCOME, This thould be the rowl of amments ceported in questions 1 to 13.

PART II. This peri thould be completed by all persons who during 1967 obrained income from self-employmens, form or nen-form.
"Sell-employed" ape:

1) persons opersting a businessor profestional prectice alone or in partnership:
2) persons operating farma wheshes they own of fent the land;
3) persone working on a free-lance basis of who contrace or subcontract to do job:
4) privete-dury nufses

Details should be supplied for each self-employmens activity sepa terely, if there is mort than one.

Nota that Question 15 applies to busimesses, erc., which you operated slone and Question 16 so situations where you were a partacr.

Governmene faris supplementery payments whould be included in gross income hut the value of income-inkind excluded.

Nef income should equal gross income less operating expenses (including depreciation). The total of all ner income amounss entered with respect to non-firm
activiries in PARI It should be recorded in PART I, Question 3 as "Ner Income from Non-Farm Self.Employment", and the rorsl with
 Employmene".

To identify a lose, write the word "LOSS" immediately ahove the net amount.
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[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ See page 2 for references to some of these publications.
    ${ }^{2}$ See pare 10 .

[^1]:    ${ }^{3}$ See pp. 42-45 for copy of questionnaires.

    - For a detailed reconciliation of these different groups see Technical Notes and Explanations, page 35.

[^2]:    ${ }^{5}$ A general exclusion not specifically mentioned but applying to all tables are all individuals and families whose major source of income came from military pay and allowances. Also, see page 35 for an explanation about the coverage of the survey.

[^3]:    
     troome from this source was assumed to be one third of the gross recejpts. Income from roomers and boarders has Hot heen included in : lis tevort as part of marniness.

[^4]:    ${ }^{11}$ A person who received more than half of his ineone from farm sources.

[^5]:    ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by dividing estimated number of persons who worked or looked for work at any time in reference year by number of persons in respective age and sex group at time of survey (spring of next year).
    ${ }^{2}$ Calculated from unpublished SCF 1962 estimates after adjusting for non-coverage of farmers.
    ${ }^{3}$ Calculated from Table A in Appendix, page 40.

[^6]:    ${ }^{12}$ Statistics for 1967 quoted in this section can be found in Table 1, page 22. The comparable 1961 table is Table 32 in Catalome No. $13-521$.

[^7]:    ${ }^{13}$ Evaluation of income aggregates from the survey indicates that there are special problems in collecting data on Unemployment Insurance Benefits. The underreporting and non-reporting of such benefits is likely due to their intermittent nature and non-taxable status which makes it difficult to obtain correct answers to a recall question posed several months after the end of the reference year.

[^8]:    ${ }^{14}$ See Tables 11 and 13, pp. 30 and 31. For 1961 data see Tables 28 and 29 in Catalogue No. 13-521.
    ${ }^{15}$ For 1967 see Table 18 in Catalogue No. 13-534, 1961 data from unvublished material SCF 1962.

[^9]:    ${ }^{1}$ From Table 8, page 56, Catalogue No. 13-529.
    ${ }^{2}$ From Table 19, Catalogue No. 13-534.

[^10]:    ${ }^{1}$ Table excludes all families where head was not a labour force participant.
    ${ }^{2}$ Unpublished, data from SCF 1962.
    ${ }^{3}$ Calculated from Table 15, page 32.
    ${ }^{4}$ Income of families whose head experienced no unemployment $=100$.

[^11]:    ${ }^{26}$ See explanation in Notes and Definitions, page 8.

[^12]:    ${ }^{17}$ See Questions 30 and 31 on reproduction of Labour Force Schedule on page 45.

[^13]:    ${ }^{10}$ Either head of a family or an unattached individual.

[^14]:    ${ }^{19}$ It should be noted that enumerators are instructed to accept the answer to Question 31 from respondent without further probing. In stuations where respondents are doubtrul about the correct answer enumerators are instructed to interpret "fuil-time" not as a given number of hours per week but rather relative to what is the normal or customary work week in the particular job.

[^15]:    ${ }^{20}$ All male earners were estimated at 5.6 million and all female earners at 2.7 million persons. See Technical Notes and Explanations, page 36.

[^16]:    ${ }^{21}$ Calculated residually from unpublished data.

[^17]:    ${ }^{22}$ See S. Ostry, The Female Worker in Canada, 1961 Census Monograph, DBS Catalogue No. 99-553/1968., Chanter 4.

[^18]:    ${ }^{2}$ Calculated from data in Table 42, Catalogue No. 13-534.
    ${ }^{2}$ Farmers, loggers, fishermen and labourers are included in "'all occupations" but not shown separately because of the extremely small sample size of female earners in these groups.

[^19]:    ${ }^{23}$ 1bid, p. 41.
    ${ }^{24}$ More sophisticated techniques of analysis would likely show that these factors are not simply additive. Here no attempt was made to ascertain and calculate an interaction effect.

[^20]:    ${ }^{25}$ See S. Ostry, The Female Worker in Canada, 1961 Census Monograph, DBS Catalogue No. 99-553/1968, page 41.
    ${ }^{26}$ See DBS Catalogue No. 13-521 p. 59 for questions on "full-time" versus "part-time" work.
    ${ }^{27}$ See Statement 1 in Technical Notes and Explanations ${ }_{38}$ page 36 for a reconciliation.
    to In addition, minor amounts of military pay and allowances are also included.

[^21]:    ${ }^{29}$ Heads who worked for $50-52$ weeks in 1967, mostly full-time.
    ${ }^{30}$ Heads who worked in 49 weeks or less, or those who worked in 50-52 weeks but mostly part-time.

[^22]:    ${ }^{31}$ DBS Catalogue No. 13-536, Statistics on Low Income in Canada, 1967, Table 16A. The low income cutoff for unattached individuals was defined as $\$ 1,740$ in 1967.

[^23]:    1, All individuals who worked or looked for work in 1967 and who reported some money income in 1967.
    ? Includes suns-in-law.
    'Inciudes daupheers-in-iaw.

[^24]:    - Sed fontnote 1. Table 1.
    ${ }^{2}$ Individuals were classifien according to their longest job $\ln 1967$. See Question 33 on questionnajre, p. 45.
    , Individuals who worked $50-52$ weeks mastly fulf-time
    - Propartion of fuli-time workers out of all labour force particlpants.
    - Sample too small for reliable eslimates.

[^25]:    ${ }^{1}$ All individuals reporting earnings for 1967.
    ${ }^{2}$ Complete data are not given for this classification because the sample was not large enough to provide reliable estimates.

[^26]:    ' See footnote 1, Table 4.

[^27]:    'See footnote 1. Table 4.

[^28]:    Individuals who reported eamings for 1967 and who were in the labour force at the time of the survey.
    ${ }^{2}$ Individuals are classified by their occupation at the time of the survey which is not necessarliy the same as during 1967.

    - Complete dala are not aiver for this classifleation because the sample was not large enough to provide rellable eslimates.

[^29]:    ${ }^{2}$ All individuals who reported wages and salaries for 1967.

[^30]:    'See footnote 1, Table 17.

[^31]:    ${ }^{1}$ A small number of completed schedules were removed prior to obtaining these counts - individuals or families whose major source of income came from military pay and allowances were excluded from tabulations. See further note in coverage below.

[^32]:    ${ }^{2}$ Institutions such as prisons, penitentiaries, jails, reformatories, mental hospitals, TB hospitals, sanatoriums, orphanages, homes for the aged.

[^33]:    ${ }^{3}$ See above for the various reasons why a labour force participant may have no cash income or earnings.
    ${ }^{2}$ A person may have been a non-participant but been paid in 1967 for work done in an earlier period. It is suspected that a number of reporting errors also occur in this group.

[^34]:    ${ }^{1}$ All individuals who worked or looked for work in 1967 and who reported some money income in 1967. Thls sample was utilized in producing estimates for Table 1, 2 and 3.
    ${ }^{2}$ Includes sons-in-law and daughters-in-law.
    ${ }^{3}$ All individuals reporting earnings for 1967. This sample was utilized in tabulating Tables 4-8.

    - See footnote 2, Statement I, p. 36 .

[^35]:    ${ }^{1}$ Table excludes those individuals whose labour force participation is described in footnote 1, Table A.

[^36]:    ${ }^{5}$ Table excludes those indlviduals whose labour force participation is described in footnote 1 , in Table A.
    ${ }^{2}$ Not all individuals reporting labour force participation in 1967 will necessarily have income or earnings to report in 1967 . For explanation see $p$, 9 .

[^37]:    - To identify a loss. write the word "Loss" immediately above the appropriate amounx.

