

The CHAIRMAN: It took me nearly that long to read it without fully understanding all its implications.

Senator GROSART: It is a very interesting brief and it is the first that has been fundamentally contradictory to some of the other views we have had. I am interested in this contradiction because I think it may be sound, and with your permission I would like to investigate it right now.

On page 7 where we have the general figure, that is the monthly disposable income of persons over 70. The average given is \$134 per person over 70. Now, I said earlier that we have had evidence that somewhere around \$120 would provide for a single person a modest but adequate standard of living. Therefore if the distribution of this \$134 is anywhere like universal, then this committee does not need to sit at least as far as economic problems are concerned. We are wasting our time. Therefore I would like to ask first of all what percentage would you estimate to have less than \$120. We have an average figure, and we have evidence which I shall not go into here, that the average is different from the median, and the median is different from the individual case. How many older people and what percentage would get less than \$120, and what percentage would get less than \$100? Let us take the over-seventy group for which \$75 is the universal old age pension. How many are in need? May I just add this, that the consensus of evidence that we have had, as I have checked it over, seems to show that this figure is over 50 per cent. The income of over 50 per cent is below the standard of a modest but adequate living. What would be your figure? Is that figure wrong?

Mr. ANDERSON: I am quoting directly from Bulletin SX-2 of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics in which they say—

Senator GROSART: For what month is that?

Mr. ANDERSON: This is one of the census bulletins, sir. The D.B.S. indicates that for the nonfarm population of 70-plus the total number is 730,000. This excludes people on the farm and people in collective households. It indicates that the average cash income of these people was \$1,576.

Mr. DAVIS: I have a figure of \$1,578, but it does not matter.

Senator SMITH (*Queens-Shelburne*): I wonder if Mr. Anderson could complete that. This is interesting.

Mr. ANDERSON: They indicate an average cash income level of these people in the year ending May, 1961, was \$1,576 from all sources, which is \$131 a month.

Senator GROSART: Is that for 1961?

Mr. ANDERSON: This is for the year ending in May of 1961.

Mr. DAVIS: Mr. Chairman, might I add a little footnote to this because I have worked with some of this material. It is true that the average in that group is \$1,576—although my figure is \$1,578—but 57.3 per cent of those people had less than \$1,000 of income.

Mr. ANDERSON: That is the point I want to make. Of the total number, 8,000 reported no income, 19,000 an income below \$500, and 406,000 reported an income of over \$500 and below \$1,000. I think that is the figure you have in mind. About 60 per cent of that group had incomes below \$1,000.

Senator GROSART: The Federation of Agriculture warned us on page 5 of their brief about using average figures; and I will just quote their statement:

All of which indicates a hazard in using averages and a disaster in stereotyping the aging.

Mr. ANDERSON: We recognize the point that averages are very deceptive.

Senator GROSART: But you rely on them all the way, but I do not blame you because that is your business.