

Miss J. R. Podoluk of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics—she is one of their specialists—has a more easily understood definition. She claims that if a family spends 70 per cent or more of its income on food, shelter and clothing it is at or below the poverty line. Included in this definition in 1961—and I will bring you up to date in a minute—would be individuals with incomes of less than \$1,500; families of two with incomes of less than \$2,500; families of three with incomes of less than \$3,000; families of four with incomes of less than \$4,500, and families of five or more with incomes of less than \$5,000.

The Economic Council, when it appeared before the Committee on Poverty last spring, accepted that definition, but it updated Miss Podoluk's figures which were based, as I told you, on 1961 data, and came up with a 1968 poverty line. They simply adjusted for the increase in prices over the seven-year span, and established the 1968 poverty line at \$1,800 for a single person, \$3,000 for a couple, \$3,600 for a family of three, \$5,200 for a family of four, and \$5,800 for a family of five. What they did, roughly, was to add \$300 to the income of a single person, \$500 to the income of a family of two, \$600 to the income of a family of three, \$700 to the income of a family of four, and \$800 to the income of a family of six and more.

Professor Emile Gosselin of the University of Montreal used a different scale. He defined a family of four in Montreal with an income of less than \$2,000 as living in misery, with less than \$3,000 as living in poverty, with less than \$4,000 as living in privation, and with less than \$5,000 as living only on marginal existence.

Hon. Mr. Martin: Does he give the numbers with those incomes in that city?

Hon. Mr. Croll: No, but we have them in our records. It is a rough situation in Montreal. None of us on the committee wants to leave the impression that poverty is a problem of inadequate income only. I will cover that in a few minutes. It is much more than that. It is employment, it is education, it is training, it is housing and health, it is environment and it is incentives.

In the spring and summer, very early after we established the committee, Dr. James Cutt of York University, who in my view is the ablest authority in Canada on the guaranteed income, and Dr. Philbrook, a sociologist on our staff, made a study in depth of the American poverty programs. This study included

the guaranteed income experiment in New Jersey which has been conducted by the University of Wisconsin Institute of Research on Poverty and which is composed of 78 nationally recognized professionals. This experiment is a three-year program involving a thousand working poor families in Trenton, New Jersey. Both Dr. Cutt and Dr. Philbrook spent some time in Washington, where they met and conferred with top officials at the Office of Economic Opportunity. I want to express a word of thanks to our labour attaché in Washington, Mr. Patrick Conroy, who was instrumental in opening the Washington doors. Two reports of these visits are now in the hands of the committee. We await the final one, when all reports will be presented to the committee at a public hearing. Edwin R. Black, director of research for the Conservative Party, and Marion Bryden and Desmond Morton, who have done research on the guaranteed income for the N.D.P., will be invited. We anticipate that they will accept, and present their reports to the committee about the same time that the reports are being presented by our own staff.

Hon. Mr. Lamontagne: What about the Liberals?

Hon. Mr. Croll: They are practising it; our problems, serious as they are, are not comparable to the American problems. In the United States they have special areas of concern which happily do not exist in this country. Do not belittle what the Americans are doing. They are applying brains, effort and vast sums of money to solve their problem. They have had some successes and some failures. Two lessons stand out from what you know and what our reports indicate. Money alone will not solve the problem, but let me finish the sentence: until we find a substitute for money, it will be number one on the need parade.

The second point is that the longer you put off dealing with a problem which so intimately and adversely affects the well-being of a large number of human beings, the less likely it is that you can control or solve that problem through normal remedies. If we deal with ours in good time, as we are doing, the problem is soluble. If we do not and we say that it cannot happen here, then we are fooling ourselves. We must learn from their mistakes. They waited too long; they did not proceed with all deliberate speed. What a price they pay! Today they live in seasons of