

Should people be forced to retire at age 65? why or why not?



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

Should people be forced to retire at age 65? Why or why not? At sixty-five years of age, and with a healthy body capable of office work just as before; retirement seems like an option that could otherwise be denied. With an average lifespan of over seventy years for men and over eighty years for women in Canada, retiring at sixty-five becomes a waste of those who are still able to continue on with their careers. Physical jobs that require extreme fitness, however, can be said as another case. Therefore, the age of retirement should vary depending on the description of the job. Office work, it seems, requires mental capabilities which eventually, but slowly, decrease with age. Those who reach sixty-five should be required to take an examination to determine if they are still able to perform with past excellence in their offices. If a satisfactory score is achieved, the one taking the test should be allowed to stay in his current job. However, if the score shows a decrease in their ability to a certain degree to which they are unable to continue in their positions; retirement can then be enforced upon the exam writers. Nevertheless, not all jobs require only mental alertness, but physical fitness as well. People who work as construction workers, for example, need to have a good physique in order to operate machinery and to relocate certain materials needed for construction. State of physical abilities progresses in a down-hill decline much more quickly than that of mental abilities; at sixty-five, it can be said for the majority that physical work is no longer suitable. In conclusion, retirement shouldn't be set at a specific age for all jobs available; Tests should be given to assess the state of mental awareness for those working with office jobs, while sixty-five deems a suitable age for requirement for workers involved in physical activities.