

a man off the top and putting another man on at the bottom you increase the number of jobs. I agree with those who say that it is better that the younger generation should have some greater opportunity to obtain work. Just at this point I might say that I have personal knowledge of young men of more than average ability, with more than average determination to do anything or try anything, who have reached the age of twenty-six years without having earned a dime working at a regular job. I realize something of the implications of such a situation, and it may be that something might be achieved by transferring jobs, but I do not think it is at all workable as a solution to the problem of unemployment.

I am grateful for this opportunity to say how great I believe the need is for a reduction in the age at which a person may qualify for the old age pension, but even so at the moment I would not advocate that this age should be less than sixty-five. I have said time and again in the last two or three years, in private conversations, and on the public platform, that the position to-day of the man who is fifty years of age and unemployed is practically hopeless with regard to his chance of ever getting back into the occupation which he formerly held. But while I realize that, I am not prepared to advocate that he should become a public charge or even that he should be placed on an equal footing with others with respect to any government scheme of assistance such as the old age pension. However, in my opinion this is the time to make a change, and I believe the way to make the change is to reduce the age to sixty-five, when in our own service we admit that sixty-five is a fit and proper age at which to retire.

Mr. DUNNING: Perhaps my hon. friend will permit me to say that in the service a man may retire at sixty-five but retirement is not compulsory until he reaches the age of seventy.

Mr. MUTCH: All I can say in reply to my hon. friend is that on one or two occasions, when on compassionate grounds and where there was justification, I have been desirous, much against my general inclination, of having a civil servant retained for a year or two beyond the age of sixty-five, I have not been received with any great enthusiasm on the part of the ministers of the crown with whom I have had to deal.

Mr. DUNNING: I was merely stating the law. So far as the government is concerned, the retirement of a civil service employee is

not obligatory until the age of seventy. The government has the right to retain by order in council the services of an employee until the age of seventy.

Mr. MUTCH: It has become recognized in practice by the government that it is undesirable to expand the tenure of office of civil servants beyond the age of sixty-five.

Mr. DUNNING: Yes, as a general principle.

Mr. MUTCH: I am not particularly anxious to labour that point. I merely wish to establish the fact that we do recognize that in this day and generation sixty-five is the age of retirement. All that I said a moment ago with regard to the railway men, with whose case I have come in close contact, is equally true of men employed in business generally and of men who work for others, in stores and other places, the so-called white collar class of workmen, who must always work for somebody else. They find it very difficult to retain their jobs after the age of sixty-five. The number of those who do is infinitesimal, and the number of people who at sixty-five are in a position to maintain themselves is also very, very small. Some little time ago—and I am sorry I do not have the document with me to-day—I read a table prepared by the statistical department of a life insurance company doing business in Canada, which showed the number of men who are independent at the age of sixty-five. That number was sufficiently small to impress anyone with the necessity for some adjustment in this matter.

While I am in entire sympathy with the aim of this resolution, I would have found it much easier to support the motion had I read it on the order paper and come immediately to a declaration of my views in this regard. However, the resolution does not urge upon the government any immediate expenditure; it calls only for a statement of policy, and I should be inconsistent with my own expressed views if I did not say that I am in sympathy with this resolution in so far as it does bring to the attention of the government, what I think should be brought to its attention, namely the necessity for some change, and I welcome it on that account.

Mr. E. J. WERMENLINGER (Verdun) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, two years ago I rose in this house to say a few words on an almost identical resolution moved by the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Heaps). On that occasion I said that, representing an industrial constituency, I had a clearer understanding of the problem of those who depend on factory employment for a living and that it