

contributing then to the retirement fund and previous superannuation plan prior to that, their superannuation is based on the last five years of service and that is still in effect, so that you have, shall we say, an anomaly there in that a certain portion of the service has its superannuation based on the last five years while another portion of the service has it based on the last ten years and many people in the service have contended that all should be treated alike. I am just passing that on to you, sir, for what it is worth and as to what our people across the country feel in that regard. I do not think I can add any more to it than what I have said. It is simply that we would like superannuation based on the last five years rather than the last ten years.

The other point, sir, which I would like to discuss briefly if I may is the case of the superannuated civil servants. We have quite a number of them across the country and it has been my privilege, as the president of the federation and the secretary treasurer of the Canadian postal employees, to cover the country from coast to coast several times, and I remember quite well meeting these groups in various parts of the country and seeing the sad plight they were in; civil servants who have given practically the best part of their life in the civil service who expected when they retired they would receive an adequate allowance—not to live in luxury, but to at least obtain the necessities of life. I have seen at firsthand that these civil servants are not able to obtain the bare necessities of life simply because the value of the dollar today is fifty per cent of what it was when they were contributing to the civil service plan, and you do not have to have much imagination to see that these people have suffered greatly.

Now, we have presented quite a lot of representations on this question. We know that the attitude of the government at present, particularly that of the Minister of Finance, is that superannuated civil servants are getting exactly what they paid for which is quite true, and he cited an example of an insurance policy you purchase from which you expect to get something in twenty years and you get exactly what you pay for. Again we agree. But, I point out to you that this condition has been assessed in other countries and that the U.K., Australia, New Zealand and the United States of America and some parts of Canada—private enterprise—have recognized the hardships on their former employees, and have definitely done something about it and we would like to think that the Canadian government is just as generous and still as interested in its former employees as the government of other countries. I could read to you certain items of correspondence I have here to corroborate what I have stated. The federation is very interested in this question and we have been working on it for many years now. Here is a letter of November 3, 1950, from the State of Ohio Public Employees Retirement System who indicate that their state legislature in 1947 granted an increase in the monthly allowance payable to those former public employees who had retired under the provisions of our Act.

The increase was effective June 5, 1947, by the authorization of Section 486-59a of the General Code of Ohio.

The increase was based on a factor which provided for an increase of one dollar per month for each year of service up to a maximum of twenty-five dollars, or twenty-five years. The increase was financed by an additional appropriation for the purpose by the State legislature.

And then from the United States Civil Service Commission under date of November 6th, 1950:

I quite appreciate the concern expressed in your letter of October 31, regarding the need for increased annuities to meet the high cost of living.

In most retirement systems, annuities are based in large part on length of service and salary. To those individuals who retired when