

have found it, is like a very fine club the members of which are married to rich wives. They talk big about what they are going to do, but when they get home they are told what they are to do. So it is here. We talk very big before an election. We are going to issue currency and credit in terms of public need. We are going to fight the money power. We are to do I don't know what else, but we have not done very much. I do not blame one side of the house more than the other. The fact is that neither side can do anything until parliament regains control of the issue of currency and credit. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Dunning) can shake his head—

Mr. DUNNING: We have control of it right here. That is why I shake my head.

Mr. JAQUES: I am delighted to hear that we have control of it, in which case there is no reason why the figure of sixty-five years could not be reduced to sixty years.

Mr. DUNNING: Why not to ten?

Mr. JAQUES: There is no need of that.

Mr. DUNNING: You are fifty-eight now.

Mr. JAQUES: Quite right, and in two more years I would be eligible. But we have this problem. It is admitted by the commission that thousands, and I think hundreds of thousands, of people can never hope for gainful employment in spite of the improvement in the financial figures. Employment does not seem to show a great deal of improvement. There are hundreds of thousands of people out of work in Canada. There is the problem, and it has to be solved in some way. It is not my place to tell ministers of the crown how to finance the thing, but I suggest that the interests of those old people, most of whom have lifetimes of work behind them, should be placed before the interests of the few people who control finance. Believe me, this knowledge about finance is spreading. You cannot hoodwink the people all the time and, as Mr. Hawtreys says, when this casual sequence begins to be understood, things will be different. It is beginning to be understood now; make no mistake about that. Alberta proved it, and do not think that if the provincial government of Alberta is blocked, that is going to be the end of it. Those ideas are spreading all over the world, wherever liberty still remains; and if we want to preserve what liberty we have; if we want to preserve parliamentary government as we know it, then parliament cannot remain in the power of finance, as it certainly is to-day.

[Mr. Jaques.]

Mr. J. A. BRADETTE (Cochrane): Mr. Speaker, I believe the whole house is grateful indeed for the opportunity that has been afforded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Heaps) to discuss this important question, which goes very deep into the social activities of any country, and more particularly Canada. I was glad also to notice that not one of the previous speakers has decried this debate on the ground that we have been wasting the time of the house. I heard that remark made on several occasions previously; for instance, it was made with regard to the discussion on the flag. No time is wasted when we discuss some national, important problem which affects every constituency in this country. Again I say sincerely that I believe the hon. member for Winnipeg North should be complimented by all parties in this house upon having given us an opportunity of discussing the all important problem of old age pensions.

(Translation) I wish also to offer my sincere congratulations to the hon. member for Verdun (Mr. Wermentinger) for the speech he delivered a few moments ago. One or two points of his speech, however, I should like him to explain. He stated that when this matter was discussed a few years ago members of the house had been called communists or socialists because they had declared themselves in favour of the resolution of the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Heaps). As far as I am concerned, I followed this discussion very carefully a few years ago, and I heard no such accusation made from any side of the house.

The hon. member for Verdun also said that those who had opposed the resolution a few years ago had stated that to lower the pensionable age limit would be to encourage laziness. Once again, I must plead ignorance, for I never heard any member of this house make any such statement.

The hon. member stated also—I do not know how serious he was—that it would be possible to effect a saving by reducing the expenses of the Rowell commission. I do not suppose that the hon. member meant to say that this expenditure is entirely useless. As for me—and I think that in this I faithfully reflect the feeling of my constituents—I am convinced that the appointment of the Rowell commission last autumn was one of the best moves the dominion government ever made. Those who followed the history of this country throughout the last fifteen years could hear murmurs from the Atlantic to the Pacific. In Ontario, part of which I have the honour to represent, there was almost open talk of secession. I grant that such a movement did