

whole shipping industry and management completely changed and the world went forward into a new era.

Take aeroplanes. For a long time men did not realize that it was possible to make a body which was heavier than air float in the air by causing it to go so fast that its speed as well as its area created buoyancy. The very minute it was discovered that speed would cause such a body to displace weight; the very minute people discovered successful means of applying speed, they were able to create aeroplanes which were heavier than air and which could float in the air. But for thousands of years they did not know how to apply that principle.

Take the alternating current in electricity. Thomas A. Edison understood electricity as it was manifested in the direct current. According to the principles of the direct current, the greater the power of the current, the larger the wire had to be which carried the current. The result was that a definite limitation was placed upon the power of the current. William Stanley, a reformer who had new ideas in his mind appeared. He had vision. He realized that it would be possible so to manage electricity that a current of increased power could pass through a smaller wire. This he did by passing the current through a transformer to step up the voltage. That principle introduced a new era. Thomas A. Edison condemned William Stanley's idea as impracticable nonsense, but William Stanley was right.

The reformer has always been met with suspicion, scorn, resentment, antagonism and even persecution. Every one of the illustrations I have given proves that. Every political reform has been met with the same kind of reception. Take chartism as an example. One hundred years ago a terrific battle was fought in Great Britain over the reform known as chartism. There were six principles in chartism: First, equal electoral areas; second, universal suffrage; third, payment of members of parliament; fourth, no property qualification; fifth, vote by ballot, and, sixth, annual parliaments. There is not a member in this house who would oppose for a split second any one of those first five reforms. To us they are obviously commonplace, but to the man of a hundred years ago they were so revolutionary that the people who advocated them were treated far worse than are the communists in our country to-day. They were alleged to be more dangerous to society. Let hon. members read the story of chartism; it will prove most revealing. Let us not, then, disregard the reformer or his ideas.

Canada can turn the scales in this war. She is the eldest daughter still dwelling under her

mother's roof. Hers is the responsibility to defend the motherland, and hers the ability. She has a marvellous people. May I read one of the last statements made by the late Hon. Mr. Rogers? He said:

The government at Ottawa has been inundated with offers of assistance from individuals and various associations. These have been so numerous that it has not been possible in all cases to send prompt replies.

Not only are Canada's people possessed of the winning spirit, but she has a large population. Just across the border is an elder sister "living on her own," but nevertheless jealously watching the welfare of the motherland. There is a sister within whose borders are over 11,000,000 unemployed, most of whom would be delighted to come to Canada to work in case we needed them. Canada's potential resources as far as people are concerned are almost limitless. Canada's material resources consist of mines, forests, farms, factories, railroads and other means of transportation, which place her among the greatest nations in the world. Canada's financial resources can and should be the result of her people and her material resources. If her people are well-nigh limitless in their potentialities, if her material resources are well-nigh limitless, then her financial resources must of necessity be well-nigh limitless. Before I am finished I shall give the house quotations to show that I am not advocating anything unorthodox, to prove that such is beginning to be recognized by men like the governor of our Bank of Canada.

May I digress for just a moment to give credit to the governor of the Bank of Canada? I had occasion the first time I spoke in the house this year to make remarks which were in some measure a reflection on that gentleman, but I had no desire whatsoever to disparage him. He had spoken under the restrictions of the present system. He is a progressive, courageous, open-minded, honourable young man of whom we can well be proud. I am going to quote briefly passages from his testimony to support what I have said.

This budget limits Canada's available money to taxation and borrowing. Now taxation has obvious limits. After a government taxes its people beyond a certain point, it encounters the law of diminishing returns. Borrowing, too, has manifest limits both immediately and ultimately. But the limit to the money which we have should be our materials, our capital equipment and our men. Let me read from the proceedings of the banking and commerce committee of this house last year:

Q.—so far as war is concerned, to defend the integrity of the nation there will be no difficulty in raising the means of financing whatever those requirements may be.