

again. As the hon. member for Kootenay East (Mr. Stevens) has pointed out, provincial governments, municipalities and private citizens have borrowed money, paid it back, and yet find themselves owing as much or more than the amount they originally borrowed. The same thing holds true of many other countries. In New Zealand the prime minister, speaking with respect to the functions of governments and bankers, says:

They were not going to run the banking system of New Zealand. He was not a banker. His job was to outline the policy that would solve the problems facing New Zealand and the job of the bankers was to provide credit and currency sufficient to give effect to the will of parliament. Otherwise the banker was master and not the representative of the people.

Away back in 1879 they raised cash in New Zealand to the extent of £4,364,000 and fifty years later they were owing £5,599,000 odd. They had been paying interest on the original sum for over half a century and they owed more than at the beginning.

I want now to place on Hansard a statement made at the time that Thomas Carlyle was writing his book, a statement made by Sir Robert Peel, Prime Minister of Great Britain from 1841 to 1846. He remarked that increased demand for manufactures would only increase machine power, and Punch at that time, nearly one hundred years ago, showed great prophetic vision when it commented upon Sir Robert Peel's remarks as follows:

Machinery in its progress has doubtless been the origin of a terrible calamity. It has made the strong man so much live lumber. But as we cannot go back and must go on it is for statesman and philosopher to prepare for the crisis that is as sure as the morning light. How, when machinery is multiplied as it will be, a thousandfold; how, when tens of thousands of hands are made idle by the ingenuity of the human mind; how, when comparatively speaking there shall be no labour for men; will the multitude lie down and unrepining die? We think not. We are not sure. There will rise—and already we hear the murmur—a cry, a shout for the adjustment of interests, a shout that, hard as it is, will strike upon the heart of Mammon and make the spoiler tremble. We put this question to Sir Robert Peel: If all labour done by man were suddenly performed by machine power, and that power in the possession of some thousand individuals, what would be the cry of the race? Would not the shout be "Share, share"? The steam engine, despite themselves, must and will carry statesmen back to first principles. As it is, machinery is a friend to the poor; the time will come when it will be a beneficent angel.

We know how impossible it is for individuals who are unemployed, yet employable, to find work to-day. When they knock on the doors of industry they are told that sufficient is already being produced without their labour, and we know to-day that industry is unable

to sell its products. Indeed, industrialists have resorted to selling products on what is known as the instalment plan. All the wonderful production of our machines we find placed on the market, a dollar down, and a dollar or a dollar and a half a week, or whatever it may be. If industry cannot sell its goods to-day without resorting to such methods, what is the use of increasing production? Industrialists realize that it is of no use increasing production unless you increase the purchasing power of the masses. I have here what has been suggested by a business man in the United States, a man who recognizes that the purchasing power of the people must be increased if we are ever going to be able to buy the products of industry:

The generosity of Harvey Gravell, wealthy Pennsylvania manufacturer, has won him friends, praise, and publicity. Last New Year's he gave \$90,000 to his employees, so they could pay off all their debts. This Christmas he is giving a \$300 bonus to every woman in the family of one of his workers—a total Christmas present of \$75,000. "I think the little woman contributes much to her husband's success and deserves a reward." Having made many friends on most front pages, manufacturer Gravell now pops this plan out to his large audience: The government give an annual dividend of \$250 to every registered voter in America. That sounds a bit wacky, such open-handed giving away of money, but Mr. Gravell goes on to tell you what happens to your money anyway, and then his plan does not sound so nutty. As it works now, I put my money in a bank for safekeeping, the bank lends my money to the government, then to pay interest to the bank the government taxes me to pay interest on my own money. Who is loony now?

Many hon. members on the opposite side have been talking about this \$25 dividend. They think it is remarkable that a government should declare that a dividend can be paid to its people. But I say this—and I say it without fear of contradiction from the minister himself—that it is financially possible to give every citizen in this country a \$25 dividend. He may question the soundness of such a course; he may suggest that it would destroy the morale of the people or that it might encourage laziness; he might put up some such argument. I do not believe there is any question in the minister's mind about the physical possibility of providing goods and services to back up such a sum of money; and this is not remarkable when one considers that financial institutions, banks particularly, through the shareholders who associate themselves together, producing nothing themselves, are able to pay handsome dividends. If they are able to do that, why should it be deemed remarkable that the