



Vol. 2. No. 2.

WINNIPEG, DECEMBER, 1937.

Registered at G.P.O.
as a Newspaper.

Five Cents

What do You want---What does Everybody want?

We are not starting a puzzle section, nor propounding conundrums, but we are asking you to indulge in a little self-analysis and then to ACT.

* * * * *

The question "What Do You Want" should not be difficult to answer, shall we question further?

Why do we try to save money? Is it because we like to look at figures in a bank book or because we fear our ability to provide during old age?

Why do we insure our lives? Is it not because we fear that our dependents will suffer Want?

Why do we patch and remake this or that? Is it because we fear that others **Cannot** or **Will Not** make new goods for us; or is lack of money the reason?

Why do we do without the things we want today so we might save — or prepare — for the future and we know not what?

Our reason for doing all these things is because we fear that the future is not secure; and there we have our answer, — **we fear for the future.**

Edna M. Hull, reviewing a book, said that in the course of the past few months she had listened with interest to "The Man on the Street Broadcasts" when the stock question was "What do you desire in life?" "The reply," she said, "whether of men or women, was almost invariably — **SECURITY.**"

Then what you and I, and everybody else wants first is **SECURITY.**

But, Security alone is not enough. The prisoner, undergoing life sentence has security. He has food, clothing and shelter, medical attention, all guaranteed. We want the same security **PLUS FREEDOM.** Freedom to choose our vocation; where we shall live and what we prefer.

SECURITY and FREEDOM — Economic Security — these are technical terms and seem incomplete to many, and trans-

lated into everyday language we would probably say, —

I WANT:—

To be permitted to provide — Food, Clothing and Shelter for myself and family;

To improve my living conditions from time to time as science develops;

To welcome new machinery and new processes as servants of mankind and to help develop them so that leisure shall be available to every citizen. **LEISURE** not **UNEMPLOYMENT**;

To speed up production that there be plenty for everyone;

To feel secure that this vast country, endowed with wonderful resources, shall forever banish poverty and debt;

To trade the surplus goods of Canada for the goods of other countries without resorting to armed conflict to force markets.

These "Wants" may seem idealistic but we all **KNOW** that they are possible. We **KNOW** that Canada has the Materials — Machinery — Men — and ability to produce abundantly. We **KNOW** that restriction and forced idleness are holding back production. We **KNOW** that our outworn system must be changed. We **KNOW** that the people have the power to elect their representatives, and We **KNOW** that these **representatives are elected to do what the people want.**

* * * * *

WHAT DO YOU WANT? You want Security and Freedom. A **FEW** already have it. You **ALL** want it and **KNOW** that it is physically possible to give abundance to all, without taking anything away from anyone, except the power they wield to keep the many in slavery to debt and poverty.

Your Governments should know what you want — **TELL THEM.**

Don't wait for another election — sign the Electors' Demand — **NOW.**

since they are there in such abundance there is manifestly, or easily could be, plenty for everybody.

- (5) That it is quite reasonable, therefore, that each one of us should join in unitedly demanding a share of this plenty, and, equally certain;
- (6) That in order to enjoy our share there is no need to deprive anyone else of their share, or of anything which they now possess.

So why not make this evident to everybody from the very first and thus prevent all opposition to our demands arising from fear of confiscation, or deprivation?

Unity for Needs — not "Isms"

Then again, every reasonable human being must sympathise with the individual who is tired to death of hearing about "poverty in the midst of plenty", because so much is written which stops at a mere recitation of these circumstances, (which all educated people admit and lament) or ends by trying to incite feelings which lead to futile expressions of indignation, or advocacy for the adoption of some particular "ism," system, of METHOD.

Indignation, however, will not by itself, accomplish anything, and of those urged by it to act effectively, remarkably few people have either the time, or the knowledge, to be able to judge whether any particular "ism," or system, will prove an effectual cure.

Even if an individual has selected, and studied, a particular remedy, with sufficient care and application, to feel confident that he has found, at least, one solution, he will still have to meet the opposition of nearly everybody else, whenever he advocates it because they, too, whether justifiably or not, will have selected their own particular remedy to uphold; with the result that all spend their time in arguing, bickering and contending with countless others, until they become helplessly divided, and often in bitter enmity with each other.

It is this wrangling among electors as to why things are wrong and about METHODS of putting them right which enables groups of unscrupulous men to exploit THE PEOPLE.

Politicians are hired to set them quarrelling as to whether the trouble is due to this political party, or that, being in power, or whether the trouble is distribution, administration or constitutional, and the party politicians are experts at introducing questions which will divide the electors into evenly balanced antagonisms, each seeking to befog the other with a "smoke screen", such as Liberalism, Conservatism, Com-

munist and other sorts of high-sounding, but meaningless phrases. Thus, whilst THE PEOPLE argue, the unscrupulous get together to press unitedly for RESULTS which they know well enough they definitely want.

Politicians Yield to Pressure

For whilst THE PEOPLE squabble among themselves about METHODS they cannot exert compelling pressure upon those who should secure for them the RESULTS which they desire.

The consequence is their governments, which should be their servants, find more pressure exerted on them by bankers, and other vested interests, for example, than by THE PEOPLE. For, as Roosevelt once said when accused of yielding to the pressure of "the interests", — "Politicians are here to yield to pressure."

The question for THE PEOPLE then, and every individual who is a unit of THE PEOPLE, is "how can we exert pressure to secure the RESULTS we desire from our servants — the politicians, and governments — so that they obey us, rather than high finance, or the policy dictated by other parties opposed to ours?"

To answer this self-imposed question satisfactorily, it is necessary that each individual in a democracy should thoroughly understand the very simple nature of that form of government.

Democracy Has Not Failed

The assertion often is made nowadays that democracy has failed. It has not failed, any more than has Christianity — for neither of them has ever been fairly tried.

Perhaps the most harmful statement on behalf of democracy was uttered by Abraham Lincoln when he said, "Democracy is government of THE PEOPLE, by THE PEOPLE, for THE PEOPLE." Because the most superficial examination of this dictum has shown it to be false, for THE PEOPLE are quite unable to govern; are unfitted, in every way, to say HOW things should be rightly ordered.

Such matters are for technicians of all kinds. They comprise subjects so technical that relatively few are able to understand even so little as the meaning of the words with which each METHOD has to be discussed. METHODS should, therefore, be left to technicians.

What then should be left for THE PEOPLE to do?

Now, it is with no desire to disparage THE PEOPLE, or to belittle them, in any way, or to underestimate the intelligence of

any individuals comprising THE PEOPLE. But, for the purpose of arriving at the nature of democracy, a body of electors most accurately can be described, from a psychological point of view, as a "mob."

One does, of course, find a few superficial electors who resent the use of that word but recognition of it in its purely scientific aspect is essential to a proper understanding of democracy.

For the reason why this word is selected is due to the fact that the psychology of mobs has received a considerable amount of scientific attention, and much is now known regarding them — what they can, and cannot, do and how they respond to various urges. No member of parliament, for instance, can truthfully say that he represents Montreal. He can, however, say "I know what RESULTS every elector, or the majority of electors, in Montreal want. It is known, quite definitely that, however intelligent the individuals comprising a mob may be, it is impossible for a mob to reason; it can only feel."

We cannot, therefore, expect a mob to settle by argument as to which is the best way of devising an efficient METHOD, we can only credit it with being able to state the RESULTS which it likes, and wants, or does not like, and doesn't want.

Electors Must Tell Governments What They Want

With this in mind, we have also to recall the fact that if we want efficiency from any mechanism, we must not ask of any part comprising it, performance of a task for which it is not equipped.

Therefore, since we know that a mob cannot reason regarding the best method of doing a thing, we must never ask electors HOW things shall be done but what RESULTS they desire. Electors must get together to tell governments what they want — they must not wait for governments to give them what they think is good for them.

For practically everybody knows, definitely, the RESULTS that he desires and the order in which he wants them. And no one can truthfully say that he knows what another man wants better than that man knows himself. Each of us is, consequently, the greatest living authority upon the RESULTS we desire, and the order in which we want them.

Therefore, if we desire efficiency in our democratic mechanism, we must never ask the electors anything other than "What RESULTS do you desire?" and "In what order do you want them?" That is the only type of question which it is within

their competence to answer collectively.

For this reason it can be truly said that Democracy is government by the RESULTS which the PEOPLE want. If they tell their parliamentary representatives their desires, their Members of Parliament should agitate until the government makes arrangements by which THE PEOPLE can get the RESULTS they desire. That is what governments are for, or ought to be.

Results Versus Methods

So the first step in any application of democracy is to find out what THE PEOPLE want; in other words, to learn what is the greatest common measure of desire among them for a particular RESULT.

A concrete example showing the necessity for this course will prove helpful at this point.

Suppose we go down main street of any town and stop men and women, asking them if they would like a hundred dollars, almost invariably the reply will be "Yes", and we will have thus found the greatest common measure of desire for a RESULT among them.

If, however, we proceed to ask them for what consideration they think they should receive the hundred dollars, or in what form they think it should be paid them, and so on, diversity as to METHODS will immediately spring up.

One, convinced that there is plenty for everybody, and that the machines will do the work for us, will say he ought to get the hundred dollars for nothing, as his share of the wages of the mechanical slaves that work for mankind.

Another will have a conscientious objection to receiving it unless he has actually worked for it. He may even advocate destroying the machines which do the work!

Some will say, it ought to be paid in gold, and others that gold is too cumbersome to carry about and that a hundred dollar Bank of Canada note is lighter, handier and in every way far preferable, and so on. And we can be sure that the more highly technical the question we ask the greater percentage of incorrect answers we shall receive.

Because, one can get unity for a RESULT, but, directly METHODS are brought into consideration, diversity of opinion invariably arises; the first thing to do, in governing democratically is to get as much unity as possible for a RESULT.

Now, the usual avenue by which THE PEOPLE are supposed to say what they want is through the Members of their Parliaments or legislative assemblies.

At present it is customary for these Members to approach THE PEOPLE, like so many commercial travellers, selling "planks in platforms" to THE PEOPLE, and posing as authorities upon every question under the sun, from the desirability of erecting a small foot-bridge, or subway, at one point, instead of another, up to the abstruse and technical points of international law! Members who have, perhaps, spent their entire lives — as coal merchants!

Just as THE PEOPLE are "double crossed" when asked to choose between METHODS upon the merits of which they are not qualified to pronounce (and, mark you, METHODS which are, more often than not, just different ways of achieving the same objective, and nearly always an objective which THE PEOPLE don't want — but which vested interests do), so also candidates, are inveigled into assuming an expert knowledge, which they don't possess, on each of the million and one highly technical questions which have to be decided in running a province or a nation.

It puts candidates in a ridiculous position — they cannot possibly be authorities upon all technical subjects — therefore, in a democracy, they should confine themselves to being experts upon the RESULTS the electors in their constituencies desire; the order in which they want them; and the best use of the parliamentary machine in order to exert pressure on the government to get those RESULTS.

Then again, one sees each member of a Cabinet, or Government, also posing as an authority upon every question that comes before the public eye.

They, too, agree with the mistaken idea that they, like Members of Parliament, should be experts on every technical subject necessary for operating a province or nation.

Government Should be Expert in Choosing Experts

In reality, however, Governments need be expert only in seeking out and choosing those best qualified to devise means whereby THE PEOPLE can get what they want and in securing timely detection and dismissal of the incompetent among such experts. If, for instance, THE PEOPLE demand "a secure sufficiency in freedom" and Douglas Social Dynamics can't yield it to them — then Communism, Socialism and Bolshevism, etc. and every other "ism" should all, in turn, be tried until one or the other is successful. There is, undoubtedly, plenty for all, so the demand of THE PEOPLE is a reasonable one and must be implemented by the adoption of one method or another.

So the working of a democracy demands that THE PEOPLE, the Legislature, Cabinet Ministers and Technicians are confined, in their responsibilities, pronouncements and activities, each strictly within their respective competence.

By this means, no one part of a democratic mechanism for government interferes with the other. THE PEOPLE say what RESULTS they want, the Legislators tell the Government, and use the machinery of Parliament to make sure that the Government calls on the right technicians to get for THE PEOPLE the RESULTS they want as quickly as possible, in the sequence desired.

It is submitted that in this outline lies the basis of a workable, practical conception of democracy, as distinct from the one generally accepted, where THE PEOPLE are asked to choose between METHODS — the Legislators are compelled to assume an intimate knowledge of all those METHODS, as also is the Government — whilst technicians, including the civil services (administrative, industrial and commercial) are continuously interfered with in the execution of their jobs by all three.

With Roosevelt's dictum in mind, "I am here to yield to pressure" one can see that in a democracy, if THE PEOPLE desire power to exert the pressure that will secure obedience to them instead of to the vested interests, they must find out the greatest common measure of desire among them for a RESULT; then tell their representatives in parliament what they want, and keep on demanding it of them, replacing them with others until they are obeyed.

As democracies are worked at present, the greatest pressure on government comes from some power which supplies practically all the funds for party "war chests".

THE PEOPLE most certainly do not supply such funds.

The Power That Controls Elections

It is this power that always demands that the proposed METHODS shall be only alternative ways for the achievement of the same objective:—its own objective. And it is the power which insists that governments shall be returned on so-called policies which amount to THE PEOPLE giving a "blank Cheque" — one which can be written out at any time for anything that will bolster up any "interest" that this hidden power may wish.

At present democracies are mad. The body politic, which is made up of THE PEOPLE, wants one thing, whilst through some of the cancerous individual units with which that body politic is infested, some

power forces the whole body politic into enduring something entirely different. Just like a madman whose reasoning powers, having become disconnected from his body, lead him to do all sorts of things which endanger his body.

Just as a sane mind orders rightly a healthy body so electors must learn to tell their governments clearly what RESULTS they want; must stop governments from acting as the mouthpiece of those "interests" which seek to thrust on THE PEOPLE conditions of life which they don't want AND which only build up in them a sense of frustration, leading eventually to riot and revolution.

As democracies now are worked electors are, perhaps, allowed to tell candidates that they want higher tariffs in order to "make work", or lower tariffs "to keep prices down." Or they may be allowed to say that they think that "tighter belts", or "harder work", or "balanced budgets", are the best METHODS of achieving objectives. Elections are, however, so "arranged" that no clear expression of the Will of THE PEOPLE for a definite RESULT ever is secured. This leaves "the interests" free to foist upon THE PEOPLE, through politicians, anything the interests want.

Alberta Votes For Results

The single exception of Alberta can be cited, for there, in 1935, the opportunity was afforded THE PEOPLE to vote for a RESULT — "\$25.00 a month and a lower cost to live." THE PEOPLE, on that occasion, returned 56 members (out of a total of 63) to secure for them that RESULT, thus, literally, wiping out every one of the "old line parties" — since when practically every single official in banking, law, journalism, finance and "big business", throughout the entire Dominion, has been "ganged up against" the government of Alberta — which, nevertheless, admittedly holds the confidence of THE PEOPLE more solidly today than ever.

The reason for this confidence is fairly evident, for, when THE PEOPLE vote for a clearly defined result it is not very difficult for them to watch, in a general way, quite a number of the moves the government they have elected make in the course of getting them what they desire. If THE PEOPLE see that their government has "the interests" ganging up against it to impede progress, they will become still more determined to support their government.

If THE PEOPLE are misled into voting for a political party (whatever its alleged "principles" or color), they can have foisted upon them anything "the interests" de-

sire them to endure. Then, when THE PEOPLE will endure no more of it from one political party, they are invited to vote for some other, whose elastic "principles" will provide an equally good (or bad) springboard from which to jump on to the shoulders of THE PEOPLE any "old man of the sea" the "interests" desire.

Vote For Results

If they complain, the reply given them is "well you see YOU voted radical, (or Tory, or Labour) but, five years hence, you will have another election and you can then punish them by putting "the other side in". Evasion after evasion is, in this way, successfully exploited at the expense of THE PEOPLE. If THE PEOPLE are wise, they will, instead, vote for the RESULTS they want. That defies all evasion. When they are not getting results they can press their Members of Parliament — demand that they defeat the government that is not obeying them, and put a new cabinet, which will, into office.

This is the quickest and surest way by which THE PEOPLE can make their will prevail in any democracy established to date. But whatever the form of government under which any PEOPLE live, however strong and obstinate the opposition brought against them, however slow their development, the Will of THE PEOPLE is bound to prevail eventually. All history proves it. If, therefore, the reader is convinced that poverty and destitution can be abolished; that our immense natural resources can be developed to this end, and he is determined that these things shall be done, let him apply to the address hereunder when every assistance possible will be furnished him.

A big percentage of THE PEOPLE already are awakened and they are working to arouse others to the realization that if THE PEOPLE did not exist there would be no reason for the survival of any institution. Therefore, the institutions, including governments, exist to give THE PEOPLE what they want — that in times such as these everyone of us could help in leading THE PEOPLE to realize their sovereign power.

Recall constantly that utterance of His Excellency, the present Governor-General of Canada:—

"Leaders who are truly such come out to lead THE PEOPLE, not to put greatness into them but to elicit it, since the greatness is already there."

COST OF GOVERNMENT AND INTEREST (from the "Periscope")

"A very general and rough calculation will show that the average man in Canada is paying for the maintenance of government at the rate of 40 cents out of every dollar he receives; that the Government itself is paying out of that 40 cents, some 24 cents in interest charges on its own debt, leaving 16 cents for the carrying on of public services.

"Let us put it another way; Each man in Canada is forced to work over four months per year for his own government—and most of this work goes to the banks—before he may do anything for himself and his family."

THE BIRTH OF A BANK

The Bank of Montreal is now 120 years old. Nine Merchants of Montreal on June 23, 1817 signed the articles of association for the formation of the Company.

The first meeting of stockholders was held on August 7, 1817 and it was then recorded that £5,000 had been paid in gold and silver.

The Bank printed their own bank-notes on the premises, having bought the necessary plates and a printing press for the purpose.

Such was the beginning of the greatest bank in Canada.

BENNETT VERSUS McKENZIE KING

Mr. Bennett declared at Halifax:

"It is clear that if we are to have a Dominion of Canada, we cannot have nine sovereign states."

Mr. McKenzie King at Saskatoon said that until control of currency and credit was restored to the government, "all talk of sovereignty of Parliament and democracy is idle and futile."

It would appear that neither Bennett or King can get their desire until the provinces are truly "Sovereign States."

THE AMERICAN DEBT

We hear a lot about taxing the rich; but Alfred E. Smith declared recently that "if we took every dollar from every millionaire in the country into a pool, that would not pay the interest on the national debt, to say nothing of paying the principal." Such a statement is not very encouraging, but it at least gives some idea of the size of the national debt in the United States.—Chatham News.

Editorial (Continued from 2)

with real life than the doctrine of the the Redemption or the list of principal rivers in Asia"

"Give us time!" is the plea of the apologist in his last ditch. Give whom time? The London County Council has had over forty years, the City Corporation has had eight hundred and fifty years"

Isn't it wonderful how we "manage on so little." MIS-manage would better describe the present world situation. Again we urge you to DO SOMETHING, and DO IT NOW. Sign the Electors' DEMAND—Write us for a supply of these Demand Forms—return them to us and we can then present United Demand to the Peoples' Representatives.

BERT'S BARBER SHOP

St. Anne's and Pilgrim, St. Vital

GENTS	LADIES	CHILDREN
Smart Business Cut	Snappy Shingles	None Better
Open 8.30 a.m. to 8 p.m. Sat. 10 p.m.		

"SANSCO"

LEMON CLEANSING CREAM

If you wish to know how much dirt and foreign matter the pores of your face contain, get a jar of "Sansco" Lemon Cleansing Cream, massage gently into the pores of the face until it disappears, then wipe the face off with a Turkish Towel or Paper Tissue, and you will be surprised with the result. It is the only cream that really Cleanses.

TRY A JAR TODAY

At all Good Stores or direct from:

"SANSCO" LABORATORIES
376 Donald Street Winnipeg, Man.

NO INTEREST ON DEFERRED PAYMENTS
up to \$200.00

— ON —

WALLPAPERING DECORATING

PLASTERING

REPAIRS and ALTERATIONS

Cooper Bros.

SERVING WINNIPEG OVER 18 YEARS
1465 MAIN STREET PHONE 53 372