

salaries were relatively low, the resultant annuity does not begin to permit the individual to do more than have a bare existence. This problem has been met in part by amendments to the Civil Service Retirement Act. In April 1948, our Retirement Act was almost completely overhauled. As a gesture toward meeting higher living costs, at that time our Act was amended to provide that those individuals then on the rolls (approximately 125,000) would have their annuities increased by 25 per cent or \$300, whichever was the lesser. This formula was not directly related to any statistical percentage of cost of living but finally was decided upon because it was politically acceptable. During the next session of the United States Congress, I anticipate the employee organizations will sponsor legislation to provide for an additional, similar increase in annuity because of increasing living costs.

That was November 6th, 1950, and in July 1952 Congress again increased the annuities to their retired civil servants of the U.S.A. by approximately \$325 per year, but that no annuity shall be increased to an amount in excess of \$2,160. So that you can see, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, that the retired public employees of other countries and in some instances in Canada have been taken care of by a supplement to their pension which they would be entitled to by the contribution they had made over the years. And the same conditions existed in these countries where you could say they were entitled to receive what they paid for, but the government recognized they were in economic conditions which they could not foresee and they felt something further should be done for these retired public servants of the civil service, and I hope that your committee will consider this submission favourably and perhaps sympathetically in your report to the House of Commons as it will be of benefit to the retired civil servants.

In closing I just want to add this. As I stated at the outset we were hesitant in coming before this committee to place anything for further consideration because we have been waiting quite some time for these amendments to the Act and I know the whole civil service across this country are waiting anxiously for the final announcement from parliament that these amendments are going into effect, and nothing we are doing is done to try and retard the amendments to the Act, and we would sincerely hope that the committee will keep that in mind and do nothing that will delay these amendments to the Superannuation Act.

I thank you very much, sir, on behalf of the organized civil servants across the country whom I have the privilege of representing.

The CHAIRMAN: Some members of the committee may now wish to ask you some questions.

By Mr. Cameron:

Q. Could you give me the names of those in Canada who have done something about the retired civil servants? You did not mention any government.—A. I understand two provincial governments.

Q. Which ones?—A. Saskatchewan I think is one. I am not definitely sure about the other one. There are two provinces and I could get that information for you. The General Electric did something for their people too, and the Canadian Pacific Railway had it under consideration but while they were sympathetic they did not do anything for their employees.

By Mr. Richard:

Q. Would you tell us on what basis they operated? Was it a flat percentage?—A. Yes. It was a flat percentage. For instance, General Electric has 7,000 retired employees who also have pensions and General Electric voluntarily increased pension payments by about \$24 to \$49 a month.