

Table A 2 shows, for instance, that an unattached person would be guaranteed an income floor of \$1,500, while a family of three would receive twice that amount.

It should be emphasized that the amounts shown in Table A 2 are for "items of basic need" and are *not* "poverty lines" as such. For the derivation of poverty lines, the income guarantee levels shown in Table A 2 should be seen as representing 70 per cent of their respective poverty lines. These income guarantee levels and the related poverty lines for 1969 are shown in Table A 3.

TABLE A 3

Income guarantee levels and poverty lines by family unit size, 1969

| Family unit size | Income guarantee level | Poverty line |
|------------------|------------------------|--------------|
|                  | \$                     |              |
| 1.....           | 1,500                  | 2,140        |
| 2.....           | 2,500                  | 3,570        |
| 3.....           | 3,000                  | 4,290        |
| 4.....           | 3,500                  | 5,000        |
| 5.....           | 4,000                  | 5,710        |
| 6.....           | 4,500                  | 6,430        |
| 7.....           | 5,000                  | 7,140        |
| 10.....          | 6,500                  | 9,290        |

SOURCE: Staff Study.

For the base year of 1969, the Committee's poverty line of \$5,000 for a family of four is significantly higher than the \$4,420 used by Statistics Canada. Because the Committee's lines allow adjustments for families larger than five, this difference is even more marked for the larger family sizes. For instance, the Committee's poverty line for a family of seven is \$7,140, compared to the \$5,051 of Statistics Canada.

The Committee's poverty lines may be criticized on the grounds that they do not take into account regional variations or family composition. On the first point, to differentiate the poverty lines by regional or urban-rural criteria would be self-defeating of the recommendation for a G.A.I. scheme on a national basis. While farm families may be able to provide some of their own food, these families receive less in the way of public and other services than urban families. On the second point, it was felt that to attempt differentiations on the basis of the age or sex of family members would involve administrative nightmares. For this reason the Committee chose the "economic" family, defined simply as a group of individuals sharing a common dwelling unit and related by blood, marriage, or adoption, as the unit in calculations for both the poverty line and the G.A.I. proposal.