

● (1530)

Many of the people in this category had spent their lifetime in that occupation, and this meant a total change in their field of work. In many cases, in the community in which they had previously worked there was very little opportunity to change their work, so it meant they had to retire somewhere else. If that was the case, they undertook a totally different kind of work. It began with railroaders who had to retire at 65 years of age. They had worked hard all their lives. They were used to working. Many of them were highly skilled. Many of them had steam licences, and this was useful in other fields totally unrelated to the jobs they had been in, so quite often they took different work, for example, the maintenance of boilers. They used their steam certificates for employment in new jobs. If they did not, hon. members are well aware of the fact that they did not live very long. Within a year or two they would be dead anyway, so they either made a total transition to a new job or they were not around to be worried about any of the problems of retirement.

These people were totally unprepared for retirement. They had been working all kinds of hours, under all kinds of weather conditions, on a call-out basis. There was no opportunity to develop friendships or hobbies, so that when they retired they either had to find a totally new occupation where they could use their skills, or leave the work force. In many cases they did leave their particular areas and their occupations entirely, went to new occupations and continued to work, which was both a desire and a need. It was not necessarily a financial need, but it was a need.

In other fields where an automatic retirement was made mandatory—this affects the civil service—most people have been able to make that transition fairly easily. They have been in associations and involved in all kinds of outside activities. The nature of their work allowed them to have hobbies, and therefore they made the transition. Their pensions were sufficient to allow them to retire. In fact, many of them retired around this time of year because it gave them a considerable advantage which could not be had at any other time of year. This category of persons counted on retirement and were prepared to retire. This was the difference. Many methods were used to solve the problem of retirement of a compulsory nature, and certainly the establishment of the Canada Pension Plan and old age security was a very worth-while asset for them; but retirement could have been possible for many of them in any case.

There is another group of people retiring. However, before I leave the first category I should like to say that I disagree entirely with the officials of UIC, and particularly the chairman when he says that in this category 29 per cent wished to participate in the rate. I presume that is 29 per cent of that group, not of the whole number. I do not think there are that many in this group, but if 29 per cent had to continue in the labour force, that to quite an extent includes the group we are discussing. They are being taken in because the chairman goes on to say that the average rate for recipients in that category between age 65 and 69 amounted to \$2,800 as the benefit which they would draw as opposed to other recipients. I presume that refers to the

#### *Unemployment Insurance Act*

other categories, the other recipients who would draw \$1,300.

That indicates that these people were able to obtain a very different kind of employment from those in the second category, and because of the pay-out I imagine this also indicates that they are receiving a higher rate of return. Let us consider civil servants who retired recently. The deputy minister of finance took an early retirement. Why? Because the job he was going to was to pay him much more than the government did. I understand that he left a \$60,000 job for a \$100,000 job.

**Mr. Murta:** Where did you hear that?

**Mr. Peters:** That was Sam Reisman.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Simon.

**Mr. Murta:** Where did you hear that?

**Mr. Peters:** Those are the figures I heard. Others may feel that they are incorrect. I have known Mr. Reisman for a long time.

**An hon. Member:** If you know him so well, his name is Simon.

**Mr. Peters:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not intimate with him.

**An hon. Member:** I hope not.

**Mr. Peters:** Perhaps some of my colleagues have been, or are. For the edification of the hon. member, I am not really connected with the George Weston chain, either. I would bow to his judgment in that respect because my understanding is only through hearsay. The understanding of the hon. member is probably factual because of his connection. However, I believe Mr. Reisman was a very valuable civil servant and that whatever job he now has he will do to the best of his ability. He is probably worth all the money he is being paid. The point I am making is that, while he may have reached the age of retirement, he will certainly be in a higher income bracket because of his knowledge, experience and ability. This is true of many people retiring from government service. I know many RCMP officers and many officers in the armed forces who went to other jobs paying considerably more than they were able to earn prior to age 65.

The chairman of the commission may be quite right in indicating that this group will be in a higher category than average. It may be that we should be able to provide a segregation in this group which would help the second group I wish to talk about. The second group is that between the age of 65 and 69—and in many cases over 70—who have worked all their lives at the bottom of the labour ladder. They have never made a great deal of money. They have never made much more than enough to get by on. Many of them reach this age and do not own a house and do not have any of the amenities of life, although they have raised their families and spent the money they earned to that end. This group will have to continue working, not for the mental or physical reasons I mentioned but because there is no alternative for them. They cannot live on the old age pension and the very small CPP they will receive,