

*Supply—Labour*

three-way contribution by the employee, the employer and the government, in much the same way as unemployment insurance is carried on. If that scheme is adopted I feel that we can look forward to the day when all those employed in industry and other types of employment will have that sense of security which they look forward to. The memorandum continues:

The government itself is a contributing factor as it too refuses to bring employees under the scope of the Civil Service Act for similar reasons if they are over thirty-five years of age. However beneficial these limited pension schemes may be, they are acting as a deterrent to the employment of many persons over thirty-five years of age and thousands over forty years of age and are a real obstacle to the mobility of our working force.

I am going to ask the minister to pay particular attention to my next thought, which has to do with the type of employee we refer to as temporary or casual, the man who has reached the age of sixty-five years and even though he is not entitled to civil service benefits nevertheless is told by the government or others that his services are no longer required. During the war, order in council 4840 was passed to make it possible to continue that type of person in the employ of the government by extending his period of employment from year to year. I submit that the Minister of Labour should review that order in council and extend its provisions so that this type of person may be kept on until he reaches the age of seventy years.

There is a large number of employees who have given the best years of their lives to the government, but when they reach the age of sixty-five years they are told that their services are no longer required. The government is one of the large employers and I do not think it is fair that it should adopt this means of dispensing with the services of loyal employees, not because they are inefficient but simply because they have reached the age limit of sixty-five years.

There is another class of employee who I feel is discriminated against in respect to unemployment benefits. I refer to the waterfront worker. The port of Halifax is not looked upon as being an all-year-round port or place of employment. Our port is open winter and summer alike while other ports on the St. Lawrence are frozen up for the winter months. It is during the five months of the winter season that we can give employment to a large number. But what happens? As I recall, they must work 180 days out of one year as prescribed by the act. Otherwise they are not able to secure the benefits.

I suggest to the minister the limit of one year should be extended to two or possibly three years in which they can work the 180

days necessary to qualify for the benefits of unemployment insurance. I believe the minister is familiar with my representations in the past, but so far as I know no definite action has been taken up to the present time. I know that the waterfront workers of Halifax and other ports are waiting for a favourable decision from the minister as to this matter. I am hoping that he will consider today a good time to tell one of the members from Halifax that he need no longer worry in this respect, and that he can go back and tell the waterfront workers that the matter will be adjusted so that in the future the 180 days will extend over a period of two or three years.

I want to compliment the minister and his officials on the manner in which they have endeavoured to take care of older employees. Some time ago they issued a news release dealing with this matter in the following words:

In recent years there has developed a considerable tendency for employers to emphasize youth in their selection of new employees. With the steady increase in the life expectancy of the average person, the proportion of our population forty-five years of age or older has reached approximately one-third. While older workers are found to lose or to leave their employment somewhat less frequently than their juniors, once they are out of work they are increasingly difficult to replace in jobs. These older workers possess desirable qualities of maturity, experience and stability. Their permanent retirement from employment would constitute a serious loss to the individuals concerned as well as to the national economy.

That emphasizes what I had in mind in bringing this matter to the attention of the minister. I feel that, while you have taken a step to make the situation known to employers, government branches have not taken advantage of your good advice to continue in employment the type of person to whom I have referred. I am pleased indeed to note that the hon. member for Cape Breton South recognized the fact that these large concerns do not always make the profit which he and his colleagues in the C.C.F. group are so apt to say that they do. He recognized it because he stated that he felt it should not be passed back entirely to the industry.

As I stated a moment ago, I feel that it should be a three-way proposition. Speaking personally for a moment, I know from experience that to get the best results from your employees you must give them a feeling of security. If you can create in their minds a feeling of future security, then you are going to get better results from them. A few years ago I inaugurated a pension scheme on a non-contributory basis which applies to all my employees over twenty-five years of age and up to fifty-five. I feel they would be more interested if they were contributing on a

[Mr. Isnor.]