

Citation: RH v Minister of Employment and Social Development, 2023 SST 692

Social Security Tribunal of Canada General Division – Income Security Section

Decision

Appellant:	R. H.
Respondent:	Minister of Employment and Social Development
Decision under appeal:	Minister of Employment and Social Development reconsideration decision dated September 14, 2022 (issued by Service Canada)
Tribunal member:	Adam Picotte
Type of hearing: Hearing date: Hearing participants:	Teleconference June 16, 2023 Appellant
Decision date: File number:	June 19, 2023 GP-22-1890

Decision

[1] The appeal is dismissed.

[2] The Appellant, R. R., isn't eligible for an increase to her combined survivor and disability benefit. This decision explains why I am dismissing the appeal.

Overview

[3] The Appellant has been in receipt of a CPP disability benefit since 2004. When her husband passed away on December 4, 2021, she applied for a survivor benefit. The survivor benefit was granted. However, when this occurred the Appellant experienced a resulting reduction to her disability benefit.

[4] The Appellant says that she has been provided a flat rate benefit of \$1013.75. She says that she would like the maximum amount allowed for under the CPP because of financial hardship.

[5] The Appellant told me that she has had financial difficulties since the Ontario provincial government forced the sale of her house. The result was a home valued at \$600,000 that was sold for \$85,000. She told me that she purchased a new house but if she cannot make the payments on her home she will lose it.

[6] The Appellant also told me that her daughter has helped to pay for the house but that she is currently fighting cancer. This has left her in a difficult situation. She has been forced to return to work while under cancer treatment to help assist her mother in paying for her mortgage.

[7] The Minister says that the Appellant's combined survivor and disability benefit was calculated correctly and in accordance with the CPP.

What the Appellant must prove

[8] For the Appellant to succeed, she must prove her benefit was not calculated correctly.

Matters I have to consider first

Financial hardship is not a determining factor when assessing eligibility for CPP benefits

[9] The Appellant raised a financial hardship argument in her hearing. She told me that she may lose her home if she is not provided with an increased benefit payment. However, socio-economic factors are not relevant in a determination of whether an Appellant is disabled within the meaning of the CPP.¹

[10] I sympathize with the Appellant. She presented as a genuine person who has experienced significant difficulties in her personal life. But I am bound by the legislation. As a Tribunal Member, I am required to apply the provisions as they are set out in the CPP. The CPP does not allow me to make exceptions to the legislation even for financial hardship.

Reasons for my decision

The Minister correctly calculated the Appellant's entitlement

[11] The CPP sets out how to calculate a combined disability and survivor pension.² The Minister set out it`s calculation in a letter dated September 14, 2022.³ In additional to including the benefit payable, the Minister also included the formula used to calculate the combined pension.

[12] The Minister advised the Appellant that the combined rate was \$1013.75 and that this combined rate consisted of a survivor benefit portion of \$534.74 and a disability benefit portion of \$479.01.⁴

[13] I have reviewed the calculation and see no error in how the Minister arrived at the combined rate. Absent any such error, and as set out above, I am unable to interfere with the Minister's calculation.

¹ Canada (MHRD) v. Rice, 2002 FCA 47

² Section 58(6) Canada Pension Plan

³ GD2-18

⁴ GD2-20

[14] While I appreciate the Appellant will not be happy with this decision. I can say that the Minister acted in accordance with the law and that is what the Minister must do.

Conclusion

[15] I find that the Appellant isn't eligible for a greater combined CPP disability and survivor benefit.

[16] This means the appeal is dismissed.

Adam Picotte Member, General Division – Income Security Section