

position, in that case there certainly should not be an extension granted to such people. We have unequivocally asked that it be compulsory at age 65, and we are a little alarmed at the many extensions that are being granted at the present time. We feel that the people should be retired at age 65. We are fully aware of the economic conditions and the difficulty of recruiting people to the various branches of the government service, and in the interest of the service it may be necessary to grant extensions. There is one point our people have always brought forward in objection to extensions particularly in supervisory positions because you will appreciate there are always people ambitious who feel they are entitled to promotions and when someone in a supervisory position has been granted an extension naturally it holds up promotions all down the line.

By the Chairman:

Q. In regard to the second part of your presentation, did I understand you correctly to suggest that in the U.K. the civil servants there received more generous retirement allowance than in Canada?—A. I can only cite the U.K. Pension Increase Act.

Q. Can you tell us what the pension was before it was increased?—A. I can if I may read this:

The United Kingdom's Pension's Increase Act was operative from January 1, 1944 and amended in 1947 to provide larger increases to pensions in the lower levels. These pensions are non-contributory and a married man at the equivalent of a little over \$400 at the present rate of exchange received an increase of 40 per cent, while a single person receives a 30 per cent increase. At the equivalent of something over \$800 the increases are 30 per cent and 25 per cent, respectively, while at somewhat over \$1,600 the increases are 12 per cent in each case. At about \$2,400 equivalent the increases are equal at 7½ per cent and at about \$3,000 the increase is 5 per cent.

Q. If I heard you correctly—you read rather rapidly—their superannuation payments are still well below Canada's?—A. Yes.

Mr. BROOKS: Is not the cost of living below Canada's too?

The WITNESS: We will say it is, but to be quite honest—

By Mr. Quelch:

Q. Did not Mr. Whitehouse say they are non-contributory?—A. Yes.

Q. Then the level might be similar to ours if they contributed to some other fund?—A. That seems to be a logical assumption.

The CHAIRMAN: They are not making any contributions.

Mr. QUELCH: In addition they could make contributions to some other fund in addition to the non-contributing fund and that might make their rate of pension similar to the Canadian rate.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions of Mr. Whitehouse? If not shall we call Dr. Senn.

Dr. H. A. Senn, President, The Professional Institute of the Public Service of Canada, called:

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, before I read to you the brief from the Professional Institute of the Public Service of Canada that you already have in your hands I would like to say just one or two words. The Professional Institute is pleased to have this opportunity to present its views on Bill 334 to this committee. The institute is an organization of professional