

**Senator Denis:** It is seven-tenths.

**Senator Smith:** Not necessarily. It is a varying figure, according to the amount of the other income.

**Mr. Cafik:** The Speech from the Throne indicates that the government is committed to providing a guaranteed annual income to those who cannot work. It is pretty clear that there are many spouses in the age group between 60 and 65 years, or maybe even younger, who are not able to work. They may not have work experience or may not have been attached to the work force for a period of time. It seems to me that in our overall social review they would probably qualify for such a guaranteed annual income, which would eliminate the need for the consideration with which you are concerned at the moment.

**Senator Smith:** I am sure it would.

**Senator Croll:** Mr. Chairman, if I may tell Mr. Cafik something of which I am sure he is already aware, the Government of British Columbia, in an act announced yesterday, indicated they are making provision for the working poor. The example that appeared in this morning's *Globe and Mail* was a family on welfare receiving \$350 and a similar family with its head working and receiving \$320. The bill provides for making up the difference. So this is already being introduced by slow degrees by the provinces, which is the one thing we do not want.

**Mr. Cafik:** This is always the risk taken by the federal government in our system when provinces are brought into its confidence. All these matters are discussed and they are asked to come forward with positions they would propose for a national scheme. This, in effect, gives them an incentive to work on this, the risk being that they will come up with a good idea and jump the gun. It is a political situation.

**Senator Croll:** I protected you yesterday when speaking. I quoted your speech in the House of Commons and particularly in connection with that point, so I made sure the federal government was involved.

**Mr. Cafik:** Thank you very much, senator.

**Senator Denis:** I wish to correct my statement with regard to the amounts paid. I had in mind \$150, but I think it is a different figure for the cost of spouse between 60 and 65 years of age. I think the departmental officials have the correct figure for the cost of GIS.

**Mr. Cafik:** We have already presented the figures, but we have not made the distinction between GIS and OAS.

**Senator Argue:** If they are available, perhaps they could also be provided.

**Senator Bonnell:** Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words as far as comfort allowance is concerned. I agree with Senator Argue that it would be wonderful if we could arrange it. In my view, however, there are only so many dollars available for the welfare of

Canadians. We must consider the overall welfare problem, and I can think of many who are in much greater need than those in homes who receive all necessary care and perhaps have \$15 over for a donation to the church on Sunday and so forth. Some on welfare do not have sufficient food. Perhaps family allowances should be raised so as to provide for the children of large families. Consideration should be given from time to time to all priorities in the allocation of funds in connection with welfare schemes.

One of the things we should be thinking about in such provinces as Prince Edward Island, Newfoundland, Manitoba, Nova Scotia and, New Brunswick, is that we should not try to put out legislation and tell them that they have to pay out something when they have not got it themselves. It seems not just the right thing to be doing in the federal jurisdiction. Maybe what we could do in the federal jurisdiction is pay a greater percentage of the Canada Assistance Program. Instead of paying 50 per cent, maybe we could say, "Look, let us do the same kind of thing that we are doing in connection with equalization payments. In provinces that have a greater need, we will pay a greater percentage of the payment towards the welfare program." So, Newfoundland, instead of paying 50 per cent, might pay as high as 65 per cent. Perhaps Prince Edward Island, where they pay 70 per cent of hospital insurance, would pay 70 per cent of welfare. In this way these provinces would participate with the larger provinces, and perhaps all Canadians, wherever they live, would have equal rights and benefits, because the federal treasury would see that no one living in isolation received less than the same benefits as those living in other parts of the country.

Therefore, I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the minister might think about raising the percentages to those provinces in need in connection with the Canada Assistance Program. If a senior citizen needs extra help, he could get it from the Canada Assistance Program, and the federal government should participate 50, 75 or 80 per cent, as the need might be.

I would like to think that the sponsor will bring this to the attention of his minister, and suggests to him that at the next federal-provincial conference of ministers of welfare, he should have an open mind with a view to assisting those provinces requiring extra finance, and who wish to give equal rights to citizens, whether young or old, in all parts of this country.

**Senator Croll:** Hear, hear.

If there are no further questions, I move the adoption of the bill.

**Senator Argue:** I have one more question to ask.

**The Deputy Chairman:** I too have one question to ask of the witness.

Has any projection been made of what it would cost if other provinces followed the procedure adopted by British Columbia of raising the pension to \$200?

**Mr. Cafik:** We have figures for a pension of \$150, but not for one of \$200. However, I think we can provide that figure for the committee.