

efficiency; second, it will increase promotional opportunities, and, third, it will favour the young veterans.

The question of the proper retirement age for civil servants is not a new one. It was carefully considered in 1939 by a parliamentary committee of the House of Commons which recommended that the permissive retirement age be lowered to sixty, and the compulsory retirement age to sixty-five. As honourable senators know, a royal commission was appointed in 1946 under the chairmanship of Mr. W. L. Gordon. Their report of July 4, 1946, page 21, line 7, suggested that:

The efficiency would be improved and public money saved if earlier superannuation were possible. We suggest that the Superannuation Act should be amended so as to permit of superannuation in such cases at the option of the government at age sixty for men and fifty-five for women.

Surely my honourable colleague from Toronto-Trinity (Hon. Mr. Roebuck) cannot complain that this bill does not go as far as the recommendations of the so-called Gordon Commission. The government has decided not to differentiate between men and women.

There is also a recommendation from the Superannuation Committee of the Civil Service, an organization with representatives from the civil servants as well as from the government. This recommendation is summarized in the Commons *Hansard* of July 4, in the remarks of Honourable Mr. Abbott:

Under the law as it now stands the age for voluntary retirement is sixty-five years and the age for compulsory retirement seventy, subject to extension by order in council for a further period of five years. The 1939 parliamentary committee had recommended that these ages be reduced to sixty and sixty-five years respectively, and the royal commission on administrative classifications in the public service recommended that the Superannuation Act should be so amended as to permit of superannuation in certain cases at the option of the government at age sixty for men and at age fifty-five for women. The superannuation committee of the civil service has also recommended earlier retirement ages than now prevail, feeling that general earlier retirement would make for greater efficiency in the public service "not only by separating those whose efficiency may have diminished, but by accelerating the rate of promotions in the service which very frequently are much delayed in large portions of the civil service in existing circumstances."

The government has therefore decided to reduce the voluntary retirement age to sixty for both men and women, and the compulsory retirement age to sixty-five for both men and women, subject to extension year by year for a further period of five years by order in council on the recommendation of the head of the department and the treasury board for reasons of peculiar efficiency and fitness for the position. The bill is so drafted as to implement this decision, but

the new provisions will not require any contributor to be retired by reason of having attained the age of seventy years until at least two years after the coming into force of the legislation. Provision is also made that effective August 1, 1957, additional retirement benefits may not accrue after the age of sixty-five years. This provision will strengthen the effective application of the compulsory retirement age of sixty-five years. We believe that these changes, while perhaps increasing slightly the financial burden on the superannuation fund itself, will nevertheless make for increased economy in the public service because of greater efficiency and improved morale.

In the light of the statement of the Minister of Finance, and considering the recommendation made by the parliamentary committee in 1939, the royal commission on administrative classifications in the public service—the so-called Gordon commission—in 1946, and the civil service superannuation committee, and in view of the approval by the national joint council of the public service on behalf of the organizations which it represents, and the special approval given by the largest of these organizations, the Civil Service Federation of Canada, which I understand has a membership of 50,000, I do not share the fears expressed by my honourable colleague from Toronto-Trinity (Hon. Mr. Roebuck) that if this subsection becomes law the civil service will suffer a great loss through the retirement of trained men who, after reaching the age of sixty will choose to go fishing or into private business. There are exceptional cases of professional men of outstanding ability who render valuable service even after seventy, but this is not the general rule. In fact, I know of many instances where men of about sixty are already showing well-characterized signs of inefficiency. So long as our system does not permit of superannuation at sixty the efficiency of various branches of the public service will be diminished by the retention of employees who are no longer capable of doing a good job. I might point out here that in banks and other business institutions sixty years is the normal retiring age, and I believe that is also true of the United Kingdom civil service.

Let us consider the probable course of a civil servant who upon reaching his sixtieth birthday has the option of retiring on pension. If he likes his work and is efficient and conscientious he will wish to continue serving his country. It will also be to his pecuniary interest to do so, because in any event his salary will exceed what he could be paid in superannuation benefits, and unless he has already been in the service thirty-five years he will by remaining after the age of sixty increase the amount of pension payable to