

come there to retire are comfortably off, but many others are barely eking out an existence on small pensions. Among this latter group are retired federal and provincial civil servants and burnt-out veterans with small superannuation benefits. All these people have a very difficult time, and I think you will find from statistics that many of them are included in our unemployed.

In Victoria at the end of October 1954 there were 2,375 unemployed men and women on the books of the Unemployment Insurance Commission. Of this number 331 were 65 years of age and over, which represented 13.93 or practically 14 per cent of the total. A similar pattern presents itself in the general unemployment picture of British Columbia. On October 28, of the 8,171 unplaced applicants for jobs from people of 45 years of age and over, 2,731 were in the 65-and-up age group. Roughly, 39 per cent of the unemployed men and 8.5 per cent of the unemployed women were in the 45-years-and-over category.

I want to point out to honourable senators that a psychological problem is involved here. We are gradually getting to the point of generally accepting, unintentionally perhaps, the slogans: "Too old at 45" and "Get out at 65". I feel I am speaking to a sympathetic audience here when I bring this up, for if we had arbitrary retirement at 65 in the Senate this house would be robbed of some of its finest members—including, of course, myself. So I know whereof I speak. It is time we realized that the chronological yardstick for measuring the earning ability, capacity and powers of men and women should be changed. Some people are too old at 35, while others can go on doing a good job until 80. What would the world have done had Sir Winston Churchill been told to get out at the age of 65? I can mention many men and women in Canada who have made their greatest contribution to Canadian life after having reached the age of 65. And yet we say arbitrarily to civil servants and people in industry that they must get out at that age. Unfortunately, also, if any of them lose their jobs at 35 or 40—which may happen through no fault of their own—and try to obtain other employment, they are met with the objection: "You are too old". The consequence is that the length of time in which men and women can earn enough with which to take care of themselves in their old age is shortened. I have seen this happen many times.

It is a tragic thing to me that a man of 40 or 45, who is just at the peak of his earning power and faced with full family responsibilities, when his children are growing up and looking for higher education,

should be summarily told by the labour market that he is too old. That is quite wrong. We shall have to change our thinking altogether, and I think the Government should start to give a lead in that direction. The science of geriatrics has seen to it that the life span is going to be longer than ever. At a national health assembly meeting in the United States a couple of years ago, a certain scientist envisioned a time, not too far in the future, when a life span of 146 years would be possible. He expressed the rather horrible thought of a man marrying at 111, remarrying at 130, and living to be 146. Happily, I shall not live to that age. The scientist did not say whether women would have a chance of remarriage at 130. The fact remains, however, that the science of geriatrics, as well as medical science, is lengthening the span of life, while the span of working years is being shortened. I think it is very bad psychologically to tell people of 60 or 65 years of age that they are of no further use on the labour market. I have known cases, as I am sure honourable senators have, of men being compelled to leave their jobs at 65, probably at the height of their experience and skill, and suddenly feeling so frustrated and lost that they have not lived very long afterwards. Also, such people tend to become a burden to themselves and the community. It seems to me ridiculous that we should insist on men retiring at 65, when we do not grant them the old age pension until 70. The two things do not jibe. We must reconstitute our whole thinking on this subject.

I spoke of the application of the science of geriatrics and of medical science increasing the span of life, but apparently other things are also conducive to longevity. I was amused to read in a newspaper the other day accounts of various people who had attained 100 years of age, and who gave some recipes for longevity that were quite interesting. The recipe of one old lady, in Missouri, was this:

Drink a nightly glass of beer with an egg beaten in it. Also don't worry, and keep calm.

Another person, Charles Macklin, 107, of London, England, gave this advice:

Every night before going to bed, wash yourself all over with good brandy. Then dress in an ordinary business suit and climb into bed.

From what I know of a great many men, they would think that a shocking waste of good brandy!

A Toronto man of 100 advised eating three steaks a day to live to a good old age. He did not say whether he was a millionaire,