

press it better in reverse, and say that it was the fact that the party to which I belong did not promise to add \$25 per month to the old age security program that produced more adverse political effects than any other factor. I say this because I had something to do with it. I also felt that in this country—and I think members on both sides of the house will agree—that this business of auctioneering the elections should come to an end. In my view this bill provides an opportunity for people in need to get additional money. I am not making a political speech; I hope I am making the kind of responsible speech that a senator should make in respect of matters of this nature.

Senator Thorvaldson further complains—and I hope I will not be regarded as too critical when I say this—that this business of the federal Government interfering in provincial programs under provincial jurisdiction is not a good thing. I can go a long way with him on that road. But the fact of the matter is that very often we are invited, and pushed, indeed heavily pushed, into it. This is not the first time this has happened.

I want to make it clear that we are not taking over a provincial program or series of programs for a payment which in the first year may amount to \$95 million. I would remind honourable senators that under the Old Age Assistance program the federal Government pays 50 per cent of the cost, under the Blind Persons Act the federal Government pays 75 per cent, and under the Disabled Persons Act we pay 50 per cent. We also pay 50 per cent of the costs of the Unemployment Assistance Fund.

The federal Government and its finances are deeply involved in social security problems. We are deeply involved in trying to solve some of the needs. Senator Thorvaldson calls it a rather trivial contribution. Senator O'Leary (Carleton), on the other hand, says it is too much. I cannot help but recall the other evening when Senator Lang was explaining the \$500 million proposed to be spent on health grants, and Senator McCutcheon said in the light of the undertakings the provinces have made in that field for hospitals, for training and medical schools, that the \$500 million was a façade and a niggardly contribution. Now, we cannot have it both ways. In my view this is a good start.

I agree with Senator Thorvaldson, as I am sure all honourable senators will agree with him, in what he said about the attempt to integrate the Indian population into the pro-

vincial population. If we are to continue to raise the level of the underdeveloped peoples in Africa and Southeast Asia, it behooves us to start at home. If we have native population in an underdeveloped condition, it is our duty to do everything we can to help that group of people.

The example Senator Burchill gave of a blind person is one in respect of which a change will be made as a result of applying the needs test rather than the means test. I think that blind lady will be in an infinitely better position as a result of the passage of this legislation, after an agreement has been made with his province, than would be the case if the means test were being applied and the rules that she and the province have had to abide by continued to exist.

Senator O'Leary (Carleton), who always speaks with such force and clarity, asked three questions. The first was: How will this money be spent? Will "Freddie the Freeloader," as Senator Walker aptly refers to him, be able to put it all over the provincial and federal authorities? I suppose that up to now "Freddie" has had ample opportunity to do this under the Unemployment Assistance Act, because that act is one that applies not the means test but the needs test. It is one to which the federal and provincial governments have been contributing at an equal rate of 50 per cent. I do not think we will ever eliminate such people, human nature being what it is, but experience has been gained in administering the provisions of the Unemployment Assistance Act, particularly when unemployment was at a high rate a few years ago. Fortunately the economy has changed to the extent that unemployment except in certain areas is not the serious problem it was a few years ago. But the great body of experience built up at that time under this act will be helpful, and we should not be too concerned about the prospect of "Freddie the Freeloader" continuing to enjoy himself and live at the expense of the responsible people in the community.

I am sure we all agree with Senator O'Leary about the danger of sapping the initiative of our people by providing too much of the benefits of the welfare state. There are examples—and you can multiply them—of where this has happened and damage has been done to large segments of the community; but between the time when the senator was a boy and today conditions in