

He thinks he could work if he could get started at something.

I do not want to prolong the discussion. The need for action is clear to everyone. I was glad we did something for the blind; though it took us a long time we eventually got around to it. People who are totally incapacitated and are thereby denied the happiness of a normal life which the rest of us enjoy and who, moreover, often suffer excruciating pain, ought not as well to be worried by economic difficulties, and I submit that at the earliest possible date we ought to extend pensions to totally disabled persons.

People will ask where the money is to come from. Well, just recently I have been reading in the *Star Weekly* of Toronto the story of some birds of passage, rather wealthy birds who flit to the Bahamas. Pages are devoted to them. One of them is Mr. Harry Oakes, and he was justifying his flight on the ground that he might avoid taxes. I read that in the same island there was that eminent banker whom we all had the privilege of meeting in the banking committee many years ago, Sir Frederick Williams-Taylor. I read that Sir Herbert Holt also had gone to the Bahamas. If they care to go there it is all right with me; but at least I would see, if I were in the seats of the mighty, that they did not take with them all the great gifts which this country has so richly bestowed upon them, and that from such people income tax should be taken to such an increased extent as to afford large sums of money to be used in alleviating the suffering and mental distress of these our unfortunate fellow citizens. One should not become too perturbed at these newspaper articles; it is likely to cause high blood pressure; but if I did become agitated by such reading matter I would have been particularly violent when I read about these three men. This man, Harry Oakes, took the trouble to give an interview in which he defended himself. I thought he might have spared us that. I suggest that allowing these people of great means to avoid taxation by going to the Bahamas or elsewhere is an affront to all hard working and destitute Canadians, and I hope that something will be done about them before very long.

In conclusion, I would ask the house to consider the case of totally disabled persons.

Mr. NORMAN JAQUES (Wetaskiwin): Mr. Speaker, I have listened this afternoon to the arguments for reducing the pensionable age, and it seems to me there is everything to be said in favour of it; I can think of no real case against it.

[Miss Macphail.]

What are the facts? It is admitted that a certain percentage of people will never again be able to find work and wages. Surely if men and women have put in forty or forty-five years of useful work they are entitled to a few years of leisure if they so desire. On the other hand, people who have reached the age of sixty or over and are not working and receiving wages have very little chance of getting work at that age. It seems that there is a feeling against granting leisure to anybody unless he possesses money. Money seems to be the one claim to leisure. Not only is that so; but if a man has not saved money by the time he reaches old age, the feeling seems to be that he should be punished for that very reason by being made to work years after he is really physically incapable of doing so.

They say that when a man loses his money his follies become vices. It appears too that if a rich man gets out of bed he is a hard working citizen, whereas if a poor man gets into bed he is considered a lazy bum. Be that as it may, the only reason I can see against lowering the age for old age pensions is the expense. It will be said that the country cannot afford it. That may be true in a financial sense, but certainly it is not true in any real sense. Surely no one will say that the Canadian people, with all the power at their disposal, all the machinery and all the skill which they possess and their well known capacity for hard work—and if any people in the world have earned that reputation it is certainly the Canadian people—it is absurd to say that all those resources if used to their full capacity are not sufficient to sustain the people who are too old to be usefully employed.

Consider the rearmament plan in Great Britain; they are spending, I believe, \$7,000,000,000 in producing armaments. I do not wish to say anything for or against rearmament; that is not the question; my point is that the people of Great Britain are devoting themselves to accumulating an enormous supply of goods which are not for the use of the people who produce them. Yet everyone admits that on account of that program the people of Great Britain are very much better off than they were before; that their standard of living has risen, simply because the wages and salaries distributed for the making of those munitions have enabled the workers to get more and better food and spend more money on their amusements and pleasures. If part of that money had been distributed for other purposes than making shot and shell and battle-ships, the result would have been the same. People do not live in battleships and do not consume munitions; but, as I said, the increase