

this type, in order to keep people working and self sufficient. I think we sometimes fail to realize what can happen to these people, and the national burden, apart from the humanitarian aspect, that is accumulated by ignoring some of these preventive approaches.

Then there is the future. The 45 to 64 group is going to be relatively bigger by 1971 than it was in 1961. This is in part because the 25 to 44 group shows little or no growth. If you assume reasonably full employment, this could mean a good period for the 45 to 64 age group, because of the shortages of the 25 to 44's. These are the depression results.

In conclusion, having raised some general problems, perhaps I should say that there seems to be no end to the things man likes to have. The economists say that man is insatiable for goods and services. This is true. At the same time, we seem also to be ingenious in finding ways of shortcutting the methods to produce goods and services. This has limitations, of course, in terms of productivity per unit, man hours employed, which are constantly going down. On the other hand, productivity per capita is going up. Nevertheless, it leaves the problem that the total number of man-hours required by this whole system is expanding very slowly in terms of the total number of persons, and of course particularly in the output of goods and services. This is all to the good. However, I think we are faced with a problem here. How do we share these hours? If you want people to work, to gain income through work, how do we share it? This is a sort of relatively shrinking hours package. Does there need to be a more consistent view on reduction of hours? If you want more people in, this is the variable that we work with, or do we not have to face, as I said in Part One, early retirement? I think that is what we may have to face, probably not in our time, but in the future. This means that to the efforts we have to put into preparing people for work is added another important aspect, that of preparing people for retirement and leisure.

I am not one of those who thinks that people will go to seed on account of leisure. I heard this argument as I grew up in Norway, when the eight-hour day came in. That created a tremendous stir in 1914 and 1920. The things that were going to happen to that population were not worth mentioning! However, somehow they got over it.

Retirement, of course, is a different matter. It means a break. We have the two choices. Are we to share the work and continue until we are 60 or 70—and people are going to live longer and longer, and will be needed less and less. So that is the problem.

Thank you, very much.

Mr. Ian Campbell, National Co-Ordinator, Civilian Rehabilitation, Department of Labour: Mr. Chairman and honourable senators: Work of this kind is of tremendous interest to the Department of Labour, and is helpful to us in the carrying on of our regular work in connection with the problem of the older worker. As you know, the National Employment Service was recently transferred to the Department of Labour. This means that there are now three branches in this department that are particularly concerned with this problem.

The Economics and Research Branch must find the facts. This is what Dr. Schonning has dealt with.

The National Employment Service have appeared before you already, and its responsibility is to find jobs for the older worker, to counsel him regarding jobs, and regarding training, and to do whatever is considered necessary at the local level to stimulate employment of the older workers.

Now, the Division on Older Workers has the responsibility of co-ordination of program activities, and deals with national and provincial organizations and