

strictions imposed by this view of poverty as material deprivation, whether one's approach is budgetary, relative, or income-share, have already been outlined. Furthermore, while many of the approaches to definitions of poverty in the previous sections of this Appendix have been criticized on the grounds that they involve subjective value-judgements, it should be apparent that in this work there can be no objectivity.

Nor have others been blind to these limitations. Orshansky has recently written:

Poverty is a value-judgment; it is not something one can verify or demonstrate except by inference and suggestion, even with a measure of error. To say who is poor is to use all sorts of value-judgments. The concept has to be limited by the purpose which is to be served by the definition. There is no particular reason to count the poor unless you are going to do something about them. Whatever the possibilities for socio-economic research in general, when it comes to defining poverty, you can only be more subjective or less so. You cannot be non-subjective . . .<sup>21</sup>

The best one can do, then, is recognize and make explicit one's own biases and objectives. Our principal bias is toward the comprehensive and relative concept of poverty as against the subsistence-level, minimum-need concept of poverty. Our objectives are: the determination of poverty lines more relevant to the elimination of poverty; the reduction of inequality; and the provision of basic security from hazard to all citizens.

While it is true that Canada's present poverty standards, whether implicit (as in the case of provincial social assistance levels) or explicit (the Podoluk poverty income lines) have many shortcomings, they do provide a realistic "jumping off" point. For instance, one question is how the poverty income lines are to be adjusted by family size. The answer of course will always be affected by value-judgments about the significance of each additional family member. If it is granted that a certain degree of arbitrariness is inescapable, then the relationships established by Miss Podoluk appear quite straightforward and useful. This implies a constant relationship between various family-unit sizes and the level of income defined as poverty. These constant relationships can be expressed simply through a points system which is called Family Size Equalizer Points (F.S.E.P.). If 3 of these "points" are assigned to unattached persons, then families of two are assigned 5 points; families of three, 6 points, and families of four and five, 7 and 8 points, respectively. There is nothing magical about using 3 points to represent individuals: this number is for notational convenience only. The Committee feels, however, that Statistics Canada's weighting system contains one major shortcoming: no allowance is made for family members beyond the fifth. To overcome this defect, we propose that one additional point be assigned to each of the sixth and subsequent persons in the family. The resulting points system, weighted by family size, is shown in Table A 1.

This table indicates that for every \$3 required by an unattached person to maintain a given standard of living, a family of two requires \$5, a family of three, \$6, and so on.