of the business cycle. And that purpose is a proper one. The people want work, not charity. Statements one sometimes hears, that they are more interested in drawing insurance than in obtaining work, are just rot. It is only when the possibilities of obtaining work have been exhausted that benefits are payable, and then of course in each case they are based on the amount of the contribution and the length of time during which they have been paid. To this scheme 2,294,000 insured persons and 150,000 employers contributed over $62 million in the year 1945, to which the government added twenty per cent, or some $12,500,000, as its share. Out of this fund $14 million were paid in benefits over the same period: as the hon. member for Vancouver East has already told the house, it amounted to 17·5 per cent. To paint the over-all picture, from the inception of the fund to the end of February, 1946—I am quoting from the April, 1946 issue of the *Labour Gazette*—the total amount contributed has been $348,309,381, and the total amount paid out in benefits for the same period was $29,530,514, leaving a net balance in the fund of $318,778,866.

I think there will be general agreement that the method of contribution up to the present time has not worked too badly, except that apparently the government's contribution has not come up to what it ought to be. In Great Britain, subject to certain statutory exemptions, all male workers under the age of sixty-five and female workers under the age of sixty are covered by unemployment insurance. The contributions are shared in equal thirds by employees, employers, and the state. The scale of contributions and benefits for males is as follows—this is another provision of the scheme which appeals particularly to me, and I recommend it to the minister: in addition to the weekly benefits there are benefits to a wife or other adult dependent of sixteen shillings weekly; as to children, each of the first two receives five shillings weekly, and others receive four shillings.

The United States works on a different scheme. Unemployment insurance is wholly within the province of the states. However, the Social Security Act authorizes federal co-operation in two ways. Federal grants are made to states to defray the costs of administering state legislation. We had a joint plan of providing for the employment offices, before this scheme came into effect in Canada. Employers are allowed credit against the federal unemployment tax for their contribution to a state unemployment fund. The federal unemployment tax is an excise tax levied on all payrolls of employers with more than eight employees; it amounts to 3 per cent of the wages paid, and covers everyone.

I point out to this house that up to the present time the fund has ben more than adequate, and that a surplus has accumulated which swells the fund very considerably. But when we come to examine the benefits paid, the inadequacy of the scheme becomes apparent. Total disbursements to date have been less than ten per cent of the fund. In this connection the hon. member for Vancouver East gave some figures. The British operate on the basis of paying the same benefit to a person, whether he is married or single, then making an additional allowance to his wife, and then a further allowance to his children. We look at it in a rather different light, and the differential between the married man and the single man at the present time is so little that in that respect the act fails. If a single person receives $4.08 in the first category, the married man receives $4.80, and in the second category the single man receives $5.10 and the married man $6, so the relationship remains about the same. It is true that the first four years of the commission's existence have been good years, and the amounts of benefit have only begun to show a marked increase in the last twelve months; but the fact remains that after five years ninety per cent of the fund is still untouched.

I agree with the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard that is no reason for raiding the fund, because it belongs to the people who have contributed to it. But let us examine the case of a married man with a child whose income while he is employed is the largest possible under the act, $2,400. The average industrial earnings in Canada in 1942 were recorded at $31.44 a week and in 1939 at $24 a week. If we strike an average we get an earning of $27.72 a week; yet the largest possible unemployment benefit under the act is $14.40 a week, or 51·9 per cent of a man's earning capacity. In the United States it is 60·8 per cent, and in Australia 53·4 per cent.

In the United States, where unemployment insurance is financed by a tax on salaries, regardless of the amount of salary, and is in all cases with the exception of four paid by the employer, the benefits range from a minimum of $15 to a maximum of $28. One might go on and quote statistics relating to England and Australia, but I believe a comparison between benefits payable in different countries gives no real indication of their adequacy. There are many disparities, differences in costs, differences in standard of living of differ-