

- (3) Coordination with other agencies
- (4) Implementation

For each of these issues, we shall comment in three stages: *first* we shall specify the main issues and we will summarize the views presented to the Committee on these; *secondly*, we will present a few comments to clarify the issues; *thirdly*, we shall put forward the recommendations endorsed by the Committee.

CHAPTER II

PHILOSOPHY

A. Main Issues

The White Paper's philosophy consists of two main elements.

1. A broad approach to problems of economic insecurity from which it derives two basic objectives of the new plan (a) coping with the contingency of interruption of earnings and (b) facilitating reabsorption into productive activity.

2. The delineation of a segment of the total problem of economic insecurity and the use of a social insurance plan to deal with this segment.

1—In general, there was little objection to the broad outlines of the new framework to deal with problems of economic insecurity presented in the White Paper. There was some argument, however, against the precise problem at hand being surrounded by such a broad framework. For instance, one view stated:

"The Canadian public is not merely being asked to consider the merits of changes to Unemployment Insurance. It is also being asked to make a value judgement on broad philosophical statements. It is incongruous that the White Paper contains this mix of purpose."¹

Neither at the time the briefs were submitted nor during the hearings, have the two basic objectives defined by the White Paper been singled out as aims that should not be pursued. Most of the debate was therefore not on the broad framework but on the specific strategy to achieve these aims.

2—The proposal to deal with only a segment of the problem was questioned before the Committee. Some witnesses insisted that their acceptance of and their commitment to the principles expressed in the White Paper led them to raise questions about the nature of its recommendations. To their mind a logical conclusion to be derived from the principles of the White Paper is that "protection against loss of adequate income for all Canadians, not only those cur-

rently related to the labour force under certain stipulated conditions"² is in order.

In the same vein, other witnesses spoke about a program which would be truly universal in its application and which would "provide benefits as a natural right rather than through acquired eligibility."³

While most witnesses did not object to progress being made in one area, there was some concern that improvement of one part of the social institutions to combat economic insecurity should not be construed as reducing the acute need for streamlining other dimensions or segments of the Canadian approach to economic insecurity. Numerous references were made to the anticipated White Paper on Income Security and Report of the Senate Committee on Poverty.

A logical extension of the argument against a specific improvement to our social institutions is the recognition that a social insurance plan may not be extensive enough. Consequently both the Canadian Welfare Council Staff Submission and the Canadian Teachers' Federation questioned the choice of a social insurance plan. But this is less of an objection to the usefulness of a social insurance plan to perform the function at hand than a plea for a broader welfare-type objective which encompasses a much broader span than the one covered by the White Paper proposal.

Conversely, the Canadian Association of Equipment Distributors stated "that the proposals of the White Paper seem to go well beyond the realm of pure insurance and enter the field of welfare."⁴

In consequence, depending on the breadth of goals and objectives defined by the witnesses, the proposed social insurance plan was at times regarded as either too narrowly or too broadly stretched.

B. Review of Main Objectives of White Paper Proposals

The White Paper recognizes two sorts of curtailment of income: interruption of earnings which is presumed to be temporary and loss of earnings which may be presumed to be permanent. Causes of loss of earnings refer to instances such as death, divorce, desertion of breadwinner, permanent disability, etc...while causes of interruption of earnings might be work-related accident, illness, maternity or involuntary unemployment.

The White Paper attempts to deal in a comprehensive manner with interruption of earnings arising from all principal causes excepting those covered by the Workmen's Compensation Legislation. In this sense, the White Paper proposals provide for interruption of earnings. It explicitly excludes cases where there is loss of income. Besides maintaining income during a temporary

² Canadian Welfare Council. See *Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence*, 3rd Session, 28th Parliament, October 13, 1970, Issue No. 1, Appendix A-14, p. 101.

³ The Canadian Teachers' Federation. See *Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence*, 3rd Session, 28th Parliament, October 13, 1970, Issue No. 1, Appendix A-12, p. 80.

⁴ See *Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence*, 3rd Session, 28th Parliament, October 22, 1970, Issue No. 5, Appendix A-22, p. 44.

¹ Vancouver Board of Trade. See *Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence*, 3rd Session, 28th Parliament, October 27, 1970, Issue No. 6, Appendix A-39, p. 108.