

[Text]

**Mr. Munro:** ... which is \$960 a year, and I am just thinking in terms of reality that any figure should show that increase.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** But, Mr. Chairman, it is those figures—and I took them from pages 40 and 41 of the White Paper which you gave to Parliament and the country—which relate to the other income that people have, and it is on the basis of the income they have excluding OAS and GIS.

**Mr. Munro:** Oh, yes.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** You say that quite clearly. It is on the basis of the income that they have, excluding this, that it is determined whether or not they get the GIS.

Now, you have three columns here. You have individuals; then you have married couples both over 65, and married couples, one over 65. I know there are some economists and statisticians over there that could do this instantly, where I try to do it in a hard way, but trying to mesh these three things is a bit difficult. I looked at the people between \$1,300, single—which is pretty close to the \$1,320 cut-off level—and \$6,000, or even \$4,500. I took two or three lines. If you look at the table on page 40, there are 20 per cent in that area from \$1,300 to \$4,500. Then, if you look at "both over 65", from \$1,400 to \$4,500, there are 30 per cent, from 40 to 70; and you look in the next column, and it is from 28 to 65, which is about 37 or something.

As I say, I took these different computations and just took a dead average. I took the three percentages, knowing that they would have to be weighted; but in one case I came out to a total of 110 divided by three which is 35; in the other case, I came out to a total of 93 which divided by three was 31. I felt that those figures were not unreasonable, that you show 31 or 35 per cent and I knocked it down to 30; that there are about 30 per cent of the people in Canada over age 65 whose incomes are in the range just above the cut-off level, where they do not get GIS, and \$4,500 a year each.

It is hard to compute this, as I say, but it is that computation that I arrived at, that there are those 30 per cent who are not poor—except the ones that are \$1,300-\$1,400, they are poor—the \$300 and \$400 and up people are not poor, but they have rights and I think that those rights are being taken away. That 30 per cent of 1.7 million people, that adds up to 510,000 people. I think that it is unfair to deprive those 510,000 people of the 2 per cent escalation. I would like to do more for them, but at least I think that you should keep that aspect of universality.

**Mr. Munro:** Again, I can only repeat, when you are quoting figures like that—and true, we quite frankly reveal that here in the tables, and you have drawn your figure from that; and we are not arguing that your numbers in terms of people are out—that it be realized that, to that, should be added \$80 a month. Some people if they look at that and are not familiar with things, may oversimplify and think that that is all the income they have, instead of calculating that there could be an additional \$80 a month there which, I think, is pretty important.

[Interpretation]

**M. Munro:** C'est \$960 par année et je pense à la réalité de cette augmentation.

**M. Knowles (Winnipeg-Nord-Centre):** Mais, monsieur le président, ce sont les chiffres... je les ai pris aux pages 40 et 41 du Livre blanc, qui se rapportent aux autres revenus des gens et qui sont basés sur le revenu qu'ils possèdent, excluant «l'OAS et le GIS».

**M. Munro:** Ah, oui!

**M. Knowles (Winnipeg-Nord-Centre):** Vous dites cela clairement. Ça se base sur leur revenu, ça dépend sur le fait de recevoir ou non le «GIS».

Maintenant on a trois colonnes ici. Les individus, les couples mariés qui sont au-delà de 65 ans et les couples mariés dont une personne a plus de 65 ans. Les économistes peuvent déterminer ceci en un clin d'œil, ça me prend du temps. Je regarde les célibataires entre \$1,300, \$4,500 ou \$6,000. Si vous examinez la page 40, il y a vingt p. 100 dans le domaine des \$1,300 à \$4,500. Maintenant, si vous regardez à la colonne «les deux ayant plus que 65 ans» de \$1,400 à \$4,500 il y a 30 p. 100, de 40 à 70; à la colonne suivante de 28 à 65, il y a à peu près 37.

J'ai pris ces totaux et j'ai calculé la moyenne. Je sais que les trois pourcentages doivent être étudiés; dans un cas où j'avais un total de 110, divisé par 3, je suis arrivé à 35; dans le cas suivant, j'arrive à un total de 93, qui divisé par 3, me donne 31. Vous montrez 31 ou 35 p. 100 et je calcule 30; donc il y a à peu près 30 p. 100 de la population canadienne au delà de 65 ans, donc qui ne reçoit pas «GIS» et qui gagne \$4,500 par année chacun. C'est difficile à calculer, je l'admets. Donc 30 p. 100 ne sont pas pauvres, ceux de \$1,300-\$1,400 le sont, qui ont des droits et je crois qu'on les usurpe. Ce 30 p. 100 de 1.7 million, ça donne 510,000 personnes. Ces 510,000 personnes ne doivent pas être privées du 2 p. 100. Je voudrais les aider, mais au moins, vous devriez garder l'aspect d'universalité.

**M. Munro:** Une fois de plus, je répète tout simplement que lorsque vous citez des chiffres comme cela, c'est vrai nous nous basons... nous reconnaissons ces chiffres, vous vous basez là-dessus pour arriver à vos calculs mais aussi ils sont justes, mais il faut tenir compte du fait qu'on ajoute \$80 à tous ces chiffres, certains qui regardent ces chiffres peuvent simplifier la chose en pensant que c'est tout ce qu'est le revenu de ces gens mais il faut y ajouter \$80 par mois. C'est très important.