

comparison was made between various countries, so I would imagine that all governments must have been included.

Hon. Mr. Fournier (De Lanaudière): What is the source of the information?

Hon. Mr. Croll: The Canadian Department of National Health and Welfare, Social Security Expenses, January 1965. That is the source of my figures. They come from the Department of National Health and Welfare.

Hon. Mr. Fournier (De Lanaudière): I suppose that is for Canada.

Hon. Mr. Croll: In comparison with other countries.

Hon. Mr. Prowse: What was the gross figure for Canada for the last year?

Hon. Mr. Croll: In 1963 it was 9.4 per cent of the gross national product.

I have some other figures here which are also interesting. The percentage of social security expenditures for old age benefits and survival benefits in five selected countries, including Canada, are as follows:

United States	36.1
United Kingdom	35.1
New Zealand	31.1
Australia	29.1
Canada	22.00

As honourable senators will see, the United States is the highest, the United Kingdom is second and New Zealand is third.

On family allowances New Zealand is first with the following percentages:

New Zealand	21.5
Canada	13.7
Australia	10.5
United Kingdom	5.00

In unemployment benefits we are at the top of the list with the following percentages:

Canada	14.9
United States	8.5
United Kingdom	3.4
Australia	1.7
New Zealand	00.1

For disability benefits the percentage table is as follows:

United Kingdom	6.9
United States	5.5
Australia	4.9
New Zealand	2.2
Canada	1.2

Hon. Mr. Brooks: Might I ask the honourable senator whether in the instance in which Canada is leading, the figure indicates that we had more unemployment in this country than in other countries?

Hon. Mr. Croll: No. It indicates we have paid better benefits.

Hon. Mr. Brooks: If you had no unemployment you would not be paying benefits.

Hon. Mr. Croll: We on this side of the house are very proud, as is everybody I am sure, that we have the lowest unemployment figure in this country for almost a generation. It is down to 2.9 per cent, or perhaps 3 per cent, which is considered full employment for all practical purposes. In fact we are having trouble living with this situation. For years we have been accustomed to struggling with the problem of unemployment, and now that we have that problem solved we find ourselves faced with other difficulties as a result.

Hon. Mr. Brooks: The comparison is with other countries.

Hon. Mr. Croll: Yes. But when I spoke of unemployment benefits you suggested we would not have to pay them if we did not have unemployment. I am saying now that we have minimal unemployment at the present time. However, comparisons are not always good. I thought those figures would be useful.

Hon. Mr. Fournier (De Lanaudière): I could not follow the honourable senator in all his figures. May I ask him to repeat the figures he gave, with a word of explanation so that we will understand them.

Hon. Mr. Croll: Senator, you will forgive me if I take your question under advisement for the moment. Let me say that this legislation is what those of us who are aware of the situation and have been connected with the social welfare field refer to as foot-in-the-door legislation. From now on the only thing that can happen to this legislation is that it will be improved upon from year to year to the point where we will be able to deal with people such as the disabled, the chronically ill, the blind, the unemployable on a basis of a modest but adequate income, by way of guaranteed annual income, and thus relieve their families of the responsibility for their support, and they in turn can go out and try