

over 65. The 30 per cent I am talking about have incomes between the cut-off figure of about \$110 a month and a figure of about \$3,500 or \$4,000 a year single, or twice that married.

Let me drive that home as strongly as I can, and I am avoiding a lot of detailed figures I have worked out because I want to make the point. That 30 per cent of 1,700,000 people represents over 500,000 Canadians, 510,000 to be precise. There are over 500,000 Canadians, 65 years of age and over, who are just over the \$110 a month or the corresponding figure married, but their total incomes run from that up to \$3,500 or a bit over \$4,000 single, or twice that married.

• (4:40 p.m.)

Mr. Munro: Let's talk about the new rates.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): We are talking about the new rates. I am using the minister's—

Mr. Munro: You are using the old rates.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): No, no. Just a minute. Mr. Speaker, I have been dealing with this matter as long as the minister and he will readily admit that. I am saying that under the new rates \$110 a month other income is the point at which you do not get any GIS, and the minister now nods his head. He realizes I know what I am talking about. I am saying that there are over 500,000 people in that area, from a point just over the figure where they do not get any GIS to around \$3,500 or \$4,000 a year. Mr. Speaker, these are the rich. These are the people who the minister and the Prime Minister say must do with less so that we can help the poor.

An hon. Member: Shame.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I think it is shameful. Somebody over there snorts or something—

An hon. Member: It is a Liberal.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): But, Mr. Speaker, if ever there was a clear demonstration of what I want to call this act, there it is. It is an act for the re-distribution of old age poverty. We are asking these people, these retired Canadians, and incidentally Canadians who had a social contract and believed they could count on their pension increasing by at least 2 per cent per year as long as they lived, to settle for \$80 a month for all time or until some government calls upon Parliament to take action again. In January they are going to get \$80 instead of the \$81.17 they would receive if this act did not go through, and \$80 it will be for years to come.

Apparently the people in this category are the rich. I confess that I get annoyed by the minister and the Prime Minister saying that we are not going to give it to the rich any more. There they are, those 500,000 people. They

Old Age Security Act

are starting to write to me about it and, indeed, it begins to look as though I may hear from all 500,000 of them. I shall need some help to answer them. But the kind of help we want, Mr. Speaker, is at least to leave them with that 2 per cent increase we have been giving up to this point.

Now, Mr. Speaker, those are the rich, the people we are taking it from. A lot of them are far below the \$3,500 or \$4,000 level, some are at the \$2,000 level or even less.

Mr. Munro: May I ask the hon. member a question? Are you saying—

An hon. Member: As long as it is not counted in his time.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. If the minister wishes to ask a question he should stand and address the Chair.

Mr. Munro: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the hon. member if he is suggesting that 500,000 pensioners will receive the flat rate of \$80 a month and not get GIS and that they are all on this narrow band above \$110?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I am.

Mr. Munro: The whole 500,000?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I am taking the figures the minister gives on pages 40 and 41, and I am trying to get some merging of single and married. Sixty per cent of the single are below \$500 a year and 60 per cent of the married are below \$3,300 a year. I have done some meshing of these figures and if I may go back to my point, of a total of 100 per cent I say 60 per cent have incomes so low that they will qualify for GIS. Perhaps there are 10 per cent at the top who are not in need. In between that top 10 per cent and the bottom 60 per cent there is 30 per cent. Thirty per cent of 1,700,000 is 510,000. That is my arithmetic. These are the rich for whom the minister and the Prime Minister want to do nothing, from whom what they have must be taken away. They are not rich, they are in need, Mr. Speaker.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): We are taking from the rich to give to the poor. And what are we doing for the poor? If asking these 500,000 people to surrender some of their alleged affluence amounted to something substantial being done for the needy, maybe I would say it is up to them to do it. What does this bill provide? We are going to increase the maximum benefit for single people from \$114.41 per month to \$135 a month, which is \$23.59. How many potatoes will that buy? We are going to increase the married total from \$222.82 to \$255, that is \$32.18 or \$16.09 each for man and wife. It may have sounded good in the headlines, and a lot of people may have thought that the millenium had come, but by the