discontent, and what the future holds for them nobody can foretell.

Let me get down now to the more realistic aspects of it, something that you will recognize easily. The guaranteed income is an idea whose time has come. Let me quote to you from the final report of the Special Committee of the Senate on Aging, presented to this house in 1966. Recommendation number one reads:

> The committee endorses in principle the institution of an income guarantee program for all persons aged 65 and over and recommends to the federal Government that this proposal be given immediate study.

This was an historic breakthrough. It was not just giving money, but a new set of values. This concept of the guaranteed income was born in this chamber. We gave it life; the Government gave it form, substance and status by recognizing it as a social right. The people liked it and accepted it. What it gives is universal payments to all those over 65 based on income and permitting an income supplement. It has within it an incentive and a cost of living provision. I am reminded of the words of the moon man—one small step for the aged, one great leap for the poor. Today we find ourselves with bandwagon support. That stems from dissatisfaction with the existing welfare.

Witness after witness made the point that welfare has been ineffective to alleviate poverty. In fact, it tends to keep people in poverty. Already there are in our country men of good will, intelligence and high office arguing about details on the mechanics of administering the guaranteed income. Some want it one way, some want it another way. I believe the Canadian people just want it. I tell honourable senators now that we cannot piggy-back the guaranteed income onto the present welfare structure or we will have an uncontrollable monster at a horrendous cost. When the guaranteed income is adopted, some of the maintenance programs must go but the services must continue.

It is well to understand the history and habits of one's country. Traditionally, social programs sold to the Canadian people have been on the basis of a foot in the door. A reasonable proposal was made, they understood it and accepted it, and when it had to be built up they went along with it. There is no use attempting to sell the idea of a guaranteed income until the Canadian people can understand it. The way to enable them to understand it is to point to the fact that it is in existence now; it has been accepted by them. What we are really discussing is not the guaranteed income but the extension of the guaranteed income to the needy.

Let me take a moment to show what it is doing now. There are 1,525,142 old age security recipients, of whom 785,000 receive the supplement; just over 474,000 receive the full supplement and 310,000 receive only the partial supplement. For every $2 they earn they are allowed to keep $1, which seems to be a reasonable incentive.

What the committee must do is to find and present a plan for a generation, to ease poverty today, to correct it tomorrow, and to phase it out the day after at an accelerated tempo. Some honourable senators will have seen the most recent reports of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. In the year 1967 there were 840,000 families, consisting of three million people, below the poverty line in Canada.

I said earlier that our approach is somewhat different from approaches that have been made at other times, although the problem has never been studied in its totality as we are expected to do it. What we are asking is: who are they, where are they, how did they get there and why did they get there? We made a preliminary classification for discussion and identification purposes. Let me introduce them to you. They are the disadvantaged people, about whom I will say something a little later. They are the blind, crippled, aged, pensioners, and mentally disabled, comprising approximately 10 per cent of the poverty load. The female head of the family group, including the widow, the divorced, deserted and legally separated, comprises 15 per cent of the poverty problem. The hard core comprise 5 per cent. The working poor are 65 to 70 per cent of the problem. I believe the Economic Council put that figure at 50 or 55 per cent.

Let us for a moment take a look at the disadvantaged, the blind, the crippled and the others I have defined. These people are no longer in the mainstream of labour, but they could be in the mainstream of life with adequate income support and services.

The female heads of families with dependent children form an important group in our country. What is not appreciated is that from the evidence even now before us women are discriminated against on the basis of sex, pay and promotion. They earn only half of what men in similar positions earn. They may not