

POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION

FIRST SERIES

of

BROADCASTS

by

William Aberhart, B.A.,
Premier of Alberta



Published by
TODAY AND TOMORROW
10350-106 Street, Edmonton, Alberta

25 cents

POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION

FIRST SERIES

of

BROADCASTS

by

William Aberhart, B.A.,
Premier of Alberta



Published by
TODAY AND TOMORROW
10350-106 Street, Edmonton, Alberta

25 cents

FOREWORD

THIS booklet contains the first ten broadcasts delivered by Premier William Aberhart of Alberta, on Post-War Reconstruction.

The first of these weekly broadcasts now being heard from coast to coast was delivered in October, 1942. Since then so many requests have been received from all sections of Canada that TODAY and TOMORROW has found it necessary to publish these broadcasts in booklet form.

The second series will appear in the near future.

PLANNING FOR RECONSTRUCTION

I hope you all listened to the splendid and inspiring addresses by the Rt. Hon. Winston Churchill and by President Roosevelt on Thanksgiving Day. For the first time in many months we heard from these, our finest statesmen, timely messages of cheer and hope which proved an uplifting change from the deluge of the recent propaganda of gloom, the like of which we have not heard for many long years. The keynote of this recent propaganda of gloom and despair has been defeatism of the worst type.

It is a monstrosity of inexcusable blundering. I do not know who is to blame, but I do say that those responsible for this blitzkrieg of pessimism are either ignorantly or deliberately breaking down the spiritual aggressiveness of our people and sapping their morale in a grossly unfair way by their unwarranted and psychologically foolish declarations. One would almost imagine that they had lain awake at nights feeding their impoverished imaginations

on all the horrors and bogeys which they think might strike fear and despair into the hearts of the people; as if fear and despair are the proper instruments of persuasion.

Whether they realize it or not, they must make Goebbels and his propaganda department laugh with glee every time they tell us that we have reached the "darkest hour in the history of our nation" or that "there is grave danger that the Nazis will win and we shall lose everything we have: liberty, homes, peace, and happiness, unless we tighten up our belts. On the other hand the mounting astronomical debt and interest charges will take years and years of hardship and sacrifice and self-denial to make good the ravages of war, and to pay the colossal debts we are accumulating." What negative, awe-inspiring, gloomy stuff that is!

Have you ever heard of anything in your life so terrifying as some of those broadcasts under the title, "Nazi Eyes on Canada"? That broadcast the other night on the Nazi occupation of Fredericton, New Brunswick, and the one that preceded it on the occupation of Ile Perrault in Quebec, were shocking examples of the sort of thing we have been hearing. Where is our psychological common sense?

What are they trying to do to us? SCARE us into supporting the war effort? Do the people of Canada have to be scared into acts of patriotism? I should say not! God help us if that were so!

I recall the circumstance of a woman in Ontario who was barred from visiting the hospitals in one of their cities, because she went from ward to ward spreading gloom and despair to every patient. Her policy followed the "scare-them-to-death" technique. She would say to the patient, "How terrible it is that you have pneumonia. People seldom get better from pneumonia. Why, did you know a man in the next ward died of pneumonia last week?" To another she would say something like this, "You are looking much worse today. Very much worse. Do you think you will ever recover?"; and so on from patient to patient she went until the authorities told her that she must not visit the hospitals any more. Of course she thought she was doing a very important religious duty. Her gloomy talk was intended to induce the patients to read the Bible and be prepared to die. Her object was worthy but her method was bad. Now the same can be said about the propaganda which we have been hearing in connection with war loans and recruiting. It was most reassuring and inspiring the other night to hear addresses of such a very different tone from Mr. Churchill and Rr. Roosevelt. God bless them!

What the people of Canada want—what the people of Canada demand, is the kind of direction and leadership that the people of Great Britain and of the United States expect. The great Canadian people are demanding brilliant, confident, ef-

ficient, and courageous leadership. Leadership of hope and vision—the kind of hope and vision that will build a reformed Canada worthy of our gallant men and women who will return to their homes after this war is won. I claim, ladies and gentlemen, the time has come to plan for those inevitable post-war problems which are bound to arise.

We, here in Edmonton, have been giving this matter some very serious thought and study, and we would like you to join with us in this important work. It is only by the people—all of us—assuming our democratic responsibilities, and tackling this task together, that we shall build that Canada we desire! So let us hear from you. Let us exchange ideas. You send us yours through the mail and we will send you ours in this series or radio broadcasts. Come on, lets go together for the good of all.

Remember please, the keynote of this series will be Post-war Reconstruction because we believe that while our fighting forces are sincerely offering every sacrifice for democracy, it is our solemn duty to prepare our home conditions so that Canada will be worthy of them on their victorious return. Let us build a democracy which will give them what they will need when they get back, the democracy of freedom from want and fear and distress.

Do you suppose, fellow-Canadians, that our boys should be expected to be content to come back to the same sort of world we had in 1934, or for that matter,

in 1939? You know very well that it is not fair to expect this of them. So I issue the call, "Let us unite to build a true democracy for our brave lads in Canada—an economic democracy as well as a political democracy."

Listen, my friends, you see I'm still pitching for an economic democracy. Back there in 1935 they told me I was crazy to say that Canada was so rich, so truly wealthy, that everyone could have, and should have, a fair share of this wealth. For want of a better name we called them "dividends". Do you remember? We didn't like, dole, grants, bonuses, allowances and such like.

"Where's the money coming from?" they asked. And you will remember that I told them that the money could easily be found, that it will be found readily enough if war breaks out. And so it was.

They said I was crazy to imagine that we could give things like food, shelter and clothing away to our boys and girls. But what happened when war broke out? We gave away food, shelter and clothing in shipload lots. Before the conflict began we couldn't give homes to our own people for lack of money, but war taught us that us that we could build ocean-going ships at the rate of one every three days, even though many of them were destroyed. War taught us that we could give away to an unscrupulous, vicious enemy thousands of tons of bombs and millions of dollars worth of torpedoes and high explosive shells. A

very costly lesson I assure you. Haven't we learned it yet?

They laughed at us when we advocated just prices. It couldn't be done. But look at what the demands of war are doing—just the very thing we told you could be done. When are our people going to grasp the solution of all these things and wake up!

My colleagues and I are still pitching for an economic democracy, and we are going to get it just as surely as they got political democracy in the 19th Century, or just as surely as those gallant women got women's suffrage after years and years of frustration, derision and imprisonment.

Now may I say this, for fear that we might damage Canada's war effort, my associates and I have observed a self-imposed silence for three long, horrible years. But silence is no longer golden. We must speak. We must all begin at once to prepare to meet the tremendous problems of the post-war era and bear in mind it is only a fully-enlightened people who can do that properly. For the next few months we want you to take a definite interest in these weekly broadcasts.

Be sure to make careful note of the time at which they occur so that you will not miss a single one of them. We intend to broadcast over this Station at this same time every week for several months if need be. We have arranged the series so that each talk will lead on to the next in proper sequence. Tell your friends about them.

Listen! there may be some hot times in the old town these nights because we don't intend to pull our punches on the home-front any more than we expect our fighting forces to pull their punches on the battlefield. We are out to help and not to hinder Canada's war effort, bear that in mind, but we aim at more than merely helping to win this all-out war. We are aiming to win the peace as well, and that's very important.

Now we are in the midst of a war loan drive. We who are buying war bonds and savings certificates, or are contributing through compulsory savings expect to receive dividends on our money. That means dividends on our efforts which the money represents. Did you ever stop to consider that other things besides money represent effort? How about the old timers who built this country in by-gone years—the old timers, as cowboys, ranchers, farmers, carpenters, bricklayers, railway men, lumbermen, school teachers, doctors, ministers of the Gospel, and others, who spent their lives on little pay, unselfishly and with possibly too little heed for the future? How about their efforts? These efforts were not, and are not yet, counted in terms of money, but should not these people too have a dividend from the heritage which they have passed on to us—an heritage which now enables us to hurl our might against our merciless, relentless and aggressive foes?

Let me put it to you plainly, men and

women. In the post-war Canada, is the possession of money and investments to mark the only measure of a person's right to share in the wealth of Canadian production? Is money to be the only basis of dividend return? If this is to be the case then what can those hundreds of thousands of fighting heroes expect—men and women overseas or elsewhere in our fighting forces who have risked all for this country's freedom? Their pay was not large enough to permit them to buy war bonds. Are they, who are risking everything, to be denied the dividend returns which all these bond buyers will enjoy? That's not all, will they be expected to discard their uniforms and pitch in to earn the dividends for the bondholders? Let me tell you something, our fighting forces will not stand for that. No siree! No one has to be a prophet nor yet the son of a prophet to make that prediction.

Well, what are we going to do about it? What ARE we going to do about it? Let me tell you my friends, there are certain basic principles of economics and finance which must be applied whether you like it or not, or whether you understand them or not. It is up to everyone of us to get to know these principles thoroughly, and to get behind them wholeheartedly.

But that is not enough. There must be the application of higher principles also. I tell you with every ounce of sincerity at my command, that spiritual principles must also be applied. This war is proving this

truth. In the securing of victory there must be a spiritual adjustment as well. We must forsake the dog-eat-dog attitude of mind and learn to live and let live.

We must recognize our responsibility to our fellowmen. We are our brother's keepers. We have a relationship to our fellowmen as well as to our God.

These are some of the problems we must face at the present time, my friends, if we are to prepare for an era of freedom from want and from fear. These are topics which we intend to discuss in these broadcasts.

Broadcast No. 2

VICTORY IN WAR AND PEACE

The headlines for tonight's broadcast are as follows:

The welfare of Canada must be our supreme objective.

God has promised victory to the Nations that stand for righteousness, freedom and fairplay.

Comradeship, not cut-throat competition, must be the motto after this war when good fellowship prevails again.

Ladies and Gentlemen: I claim that if we wish to get out of this mess, we will all have to unite in one mighty effort to carry out the simple but many-sided program of reconstruction that I wish to lay before you, and which I am convinced will solve our problems. There will be hard and worth-while work for each of us to do, and I assure you where you see persons working together intensely and earnestly, you usually find that they seldom have time to argue about non-essentials. No Sir! They want to get on with the job.

Now I take it that one of the first facts that we must face in the post-war problems is the obvious one: that tens of thousands of our brave lads, through nervous strain and shock, may be quite unable to return to employment after the war. Some may be thus incapacitated for a

period of shorter or longer duration, while others may never be fit to return to work again. How are they to be treated? What are they going to do with themselves? Have we any responsibility for their welfare? Is our treatment to be a hit-and-miss, on-the-spur-of-the-moment variety, or shall we be ready beforehand? That's one problem that must be faced.

You know what happened after the last war! Our fighting heroes came back, many of them with bodies and nerves broken and unstrung. No matter how willing and brave they were, they were unable to find their places in society again. They did not feel like settling down to ordinary civilian life. It was a new experience to them and to us. We could not understand why they seemed so restless, but the truth of the matter was, we were living under a vicious financial and economic system, and the boys did not come back to a Canada of comrades. When they returned, they found themselves plunged into a wildly speculative competition in earning their living. In their weakened, nervous state, they were tossed into a veritable maelstrom, a business world in which speculation on stock markets and get-rich-quick promotions, land-grabbing, money-lending and cut-throat business practices were on the crest of a rising wave that was going to cast us into one of the worst depressions that the world has ever known.

Could we expect them to catch their feet in such conditions as that? How differ-

ent is was from the army life they had known for four dreadful years, where, in the face of grave difficulty and of death they had learned to treat their associates as comrades; where they had been taught by grim necessity to help each other; and where they had experienced the thrill of fighting for and gaining a common objective despite terrible but willing sacrifices. How very different it was, therefore, for them to find themselves suddenly thrown into a business world where every man's tongue, if not his hand, was against his brother.

Our soldier boys at that time knew that there was something wrong with the whole system, but they of that generation, did not know how to correct it, and what's more, they didn't have time to think it through to a conclusion. They were stamped into the most unsatisfactory arrangements.

THIS TIME **our** boys in the fighting forces know one fundamental thing. They know that there can be freedom from want and fear. It has been demonstrated to them that Canāda can provide food, clothing, shelter, health and education for all her people. Now think that over a moment! And remember that many of them will be back again.

Our boys have known want—dire want. They have been without food, clothing, and shelter, and they were told that nothing could be done for them. They

have known fear of unemployment. They have ridden the rods and endured hardships of all kinds in their attempt to find work. But there was no work, because there was a surplus of goods and no money to buy them.

But now they have been promised in that historic document "The Atlantic Charter" that they are fighting for freedom from want and fear, and when they win this war—when they come back here to join hands with the men and women who, working in factories or on farms, have never faltered in supplying the requirements of war, they will all demand the freedom from want and fear which they have been promised. Surely they have a right to do that.

It is our job, therefore, to get busy and lay the foundations of a political and economic democracy in which that promise of the Atlantic Charter can be fulfilled.

I am coming shortly to the first step to be taken toward this objective, but before doing so, I would like everyone of you to be assured of two things: First, the United Nations will win this war although it may be possible that not all of the nations now in the Union may remain in it. Victory is on the side of the Democracies at any rate, and not on that of the Axis Powers. Second, no matter how tremendous the task may seem, the promise of freedom from want and fear can and must be kept. We must keep faith with the people who are so loyally and faithfully

making these great sacrifices.

I base my faith of ultimate victory for the British Commonwealth of Nations and the United States upon something far deeper and more authentic than our own unprecedented production of war materials and the splendid fighting qualities of our soldiery. Thank God we have these things and the quality of our men is magnificent. But I say, I base my faith upon a divine promise given 700 or more years before the birth of Christ. It should be clear to every student of the Bible that the British Commonwealth, the United States, and their allies are truly God's battle axe at this time. His covenant for us is to be found in Isa. 54:17. It reads like this: "No weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper, and every tongue that shall rise against thee in judgment, thou shall condemn."

These weapons referred to may, by sudden and unforeseen attacks, make headway for a time, but the Word of God says they shall not continue to prosper. God assures us that the tongue that issues all this false propaganda against Israel shall in due time be condemned.

Besides that hint, however, this covenant is as clearly addressed to London and Washington as you or I would address a letter. Here is the address. It is found in the very same verse and reads, "This is the heritage of the servants of the Lord." Are the British Commonwealth and the United States not the servants of

the Lord in this struggle against the anti-Christian paganism of the Nazis and the Japanese? Who else is upholding the God-given principles of Christianity?

Without any shadow of doubt the servants of the Lord stand revealed to us today as the Anglo-Saxon race: The Angles who were so named because, as one of the Lost Tribes, they worshipped the golden calf; the Saxons who were so named because they were the sons of Isaac or Isaac-sons; the Danes who were of the tribe of Dan; and the Scoaths or Scots who lived in tents and who, even to this day, pride themselves on their woollen tartan cloaks of many colors.

I am convinced that if you give this matter the study that it deserves, you will find that the lost Ten Tribes, who were chosen by God to be His instrument in carrying out His plans for humanity, are today reunited under Ephraim (that is Great Britain) and have become a company of nations together with Manasseh (that is the United States) which is the mighty nation beyond the waters. It therefore follows that the British Commonwealth of Nations and the United States are the servants of the Lord referred to in this text. Do you not realize that fact?

These two nations, therefore, are included in the divine covenant, and the divine prophecy concerning them **MUST** be fulfilled. The whole thing is so significantly definite and so plainly evident that every Anglo-Saxon should joyfully recog-

nize it as his heritage. Indeed it is most re-assuring, I say, MOST REASSURING, to know that through the fulfilment of prophecy, God's promises of victory to His servants, and His unbounded interest in the welfare of the human race will be fulfilled to the letter.

What a tremendous responsibility this places upon every one of us to dedicate ourselves in all humility to the task that is set before us of establishing a new Social Order in which the Christian ideals of individual liberty, security and righteousness shall prevail.

The point at the moment, however, is that, with this divine assurance of victory, we should go forward with all confidence. Our past history should give us much assurance also. No doubt you have read the story of the Spanish Armada. The Armada, you remember, met its doom because at the crucial moment a strong wind drove the big ships on the rocks in their attempt to get around the northern part of Scotland, and avoid the smaller but more dangerous British Navy.

Our history contains many such evidences of divine intervention. What about Dunkirk? Who made the tempestuous sea suddenly to become calm as our retreating troops reached the coast? Who permitted all those numerous little launches and pleasure boats to cross the usually wild North Sea and rescue 400,000 of our men?

Why can't we recognize these divine interventions as fulfilments of God's pro-

phetic promises and be thankful to God Almighty for them? Why can't we understand the absolute truth of that grand old Hymn of the British people when we sing:

“O God, our help in ages past,
Our hope for years to come,
Our shelter from the stormy blast,
And our eternal home.”

And the second stanza:

“Under the shadow of Thy throne
Thy saints have dwelt secure,
Sufficient is thine arm alone.
And our defence is sure.”

Is it true that the Arm of God alone is sufficient to satisfy our faith? And does our confidence not enable us to say, “Our defence is sure”?

Yes, God is going to give us victory in this war. Remember no weapon that is formed against Israel shall prosper. God's Word cannot be broken. The present United Nations are God's great battle axe to overthrow those who would take freedom, righteousness, happiness and Christianity from the earth, and in their place attempt to establish bondage, paganism, regimentation, and infidelity or the rule of hate. The United Nations will win.

Let us, therefore, go forward with vision and hope. Let us pay no attention to those who would spread gloom and discouragement and despair amongst us.

Some would tell us that even if we win, we will be impoverished because we shall have such an astronomical debt we will never be able to bear the burden.

Come now! Let us laugh at their fears by getting ready to meet that debt problem; yes, and the problem of unemployment as well; and furthermore, that of restlessness and depression also. How? Well, I intend to discuss these matters with you if you are really interested.

The first step in preparation, however, my friends, lies with you and you, each and all. I want you to get your friends together. Talk over these problems among yourselves. Organize into little groups of people who can work together in harmony.

Read and listen; then listen and read. Talk these things out to a conclusion. Then check on your opinions. If we keep on we'll see a light at the end of the tunnel, and then we can prepare ourselves for action, always remembering that in a true democracy, leadership must come from the people themselves. That's why you must get together.

Leadership after this war must rise from your midst, because when you, and our war heroes get together you are not going to stand any longer for the kind of politics that comes from the Old Line Party Machines. They have kept you on the rack too long already. When our boys come back after the war is won, we must join them in demanding the kind of democracy in which we will have some say not only on election day, but every day. We must insist on having democratic liberty, economic security and freedom of individual development.

CANADIAN MORALE
The Spearhead to Victory

Oliver Cromwell had a slogan that he often repeated to his brave, well-trained troops. It was this — "Trust in God and keep your powder dry." That is good advice, and may I say that there is nothing so effective in the loosening of the shackles and prison houses of antiquated systems as the explosive powder of a New Idea. I would like you to kindle a torch at this time that will lighten up the whole of Canada, and break down the strongholds of traditionalism and blind prejudice.

In the previous broadcasts I pointed out that as we face the future at this critical time in our country's history, we have every encouragement to press on to victory. So let us put away all this gloomy and discouraging propaganda! It should have no place in the great task which confronts us. On our side we have the ideals of God's light, of Christianity and of good-

will to all men. Furthermore, let us rejoice in the Divine promise, that in this conflict, between paganism and Christianity, Anglo-Saxon Israel is to be used as His great battle-axe to bring victory. That ought to give us much assurance.

Now, tonight the headline of my talk is "Canadian Morale: or, The **Spirit** of Our People is the **Spearhead** of Victory."

What we need today, and need urgently, is a re-vitalization and strengthening of our morale. And that can only come from within ourselves—the birth of a deep and passionate confidence in the future, the implantation of a growing, virile, mutual concept which will crack open the tomb-stone of the dead past and allow true Democracy to blossom forth in all its matchless glory.

The Nazis' greatest hope is not their dive-bombers, nor their tanks, nor their U-boats, nor anything like that. They are depending upon the mad fanaticism, born of hate, and on the overwhelming ambition to dominate, which has been instilled and drilled into their people. Against their frenzied fanaticism and ungodly cruelty, we can, and we must invoke that high degree of national morale which springs from the conviction that what we are fighting for is worthy of our greatest sacrifice—yes, the sacrifice of life itself if need be.

And that, ladies and gentlemen, will not be achieved by forsaking our principles and descending to the level of our enemies. Mark that well!

We are told that we must fight fire with fire. That is a misapplication of that old maxim of prairie colloquialism. Surely you do not believe that because the Nazis and the heathen Japanese are waging war against us with ungodly bitterness and blind hate in their hearts, that we must descend to their level and retaliate with ill-bred hatred and the pagan spirit of brutish cruelty?

Hate is born of fear and selfishness. The man who harbours fear is defeating himself in that very act, and the attribute of selfishness always poisons and destroys the subject in which it finds lodgement.

Our present problem is largely due to the blind blundering and dog-eat-dog principles which we tolerated during those pre-war years. These must go! I insist that it is only by remaining steadfastly true to the God-established principles of fair-play and goodwill, and, in so doing, looking beyond the hideous carnage of the war, to the world we shall create after it, that we shall generate that high quality of national morale we need so desperately just now.

1. Look you here, my friends, each day the focus of this war is shifting more and more to **post-war reconstruction**. It has become an urgent and essential factor in our national war effort. Unless the people, all the people, have a deep conviction about the objective, for which they are fighting and sacrificing, how can we expect to have the invincible national unity

and the high degree of morale essential to a total war effort?

May I ask you a few pertinent questions. Who, do you expect, would be enthusiastic in trying to preserve and perpetuate the miserable, antiquated and un-Christian order of social injustice and oppression which we had before the war, with all its evils of poverty, unemployment and general insecurity? Do **they** appeal to **you**? Would you like to see a return of that poverty, that unemployment and that economic insecurity? Would you expect the men of our fighting forces to go into battle with much zeal if it was only to uphold a system which has so little to be said in its favor, and which has created so much want, so much suffering, so much havoc among the young and the old in a world of abundance? There is only one answer to these questions.

Yet, my friends, after more than three years of war, and after three years of vague, indefinite, ineffective babblings, about a new post-war order, and in the face of the general realization that unless we lay the foundations of a new democratic order **now**, during the war, it will be too late afterwards, there is **nothing** in sight but the disastrous, undesirable features of the old inadequate and discredited pre-war system as strongly entrenched as ever.

We have the same old taxation and debt systems, the same old money monopoly, the same devastating wage system.

We have the same old line political patronage, the same old price manipulations, and the same disastrous treatment of agriculture. These have nearly wrecked our civilization and economy in the past. Surely this is well-known to everyone.

No wonder people are asking, "How in the world can we expect **this system** which created such havoc in peace time to serve us efficiently under war conditions? And what is going to happen if we continue to preserve it until after the war? How on earth can we hope to build a new democratic order to give us the results we want on such a foundation, when before the war, it produced the very opposite to the results we desired?"

Can you blame the people for thinking and talking like that? No wonder there is so much uneasiness, so much apprehension abroad about the future. People are not satisfied. They want a definite, worthwhile objective.

2. Then again, how can we justify our denunciation of Nazi regimentation and the ruthless domination of the people by its vast State bureaucracy when we turn around and adopt the same measures, pleading that they are necessary? Must we fight totalitarianism with one hand and adopt State Bureaucracy, its twin sister, with the other? Do we consider democracy such a poor, weak, futile and childish thing that it must be scrapped in time of stress? I challenge that. Democracy, like Christianity, has not been given a fair

chance. And by Democracy I do not mean the pre-war variety with all the inefficiency of a finance-ridden state. No, I mean a full functioning democracy, both political and economic, under which the people do get the results they want.

Do you imagine for one moment that such an efficient system as political and economic democracy would not be infinitely superior to a system of socialistic bureaucracy which is so inefficient that it has to regiment people, nationalize all their industries and eliminate every trace of freedom and individual development?

Regimentation and bureaucracy go hand in hand. I always picture Socialism or Bureaucracy as a band-waggon with the people harnessed between the shafts, and the bureaucrats and the budding dictators riding in it, taking turns to blow their trumpets and to lash the people.

Let me be brutally frank, ladies and gentlemen, the time has passed for mincing our words: How can we justify all this nonsense? What is the sense of condemning the ruthlessness of national socialism in Germany in one breath, and then turning around and advocating the adoption of socialism here in Canada as the only possible alternative to the pre-war perverted democracy!

That is the kind of thing that shakes the confidence of people to the core. That is what saps their morale.

These are fundamentally important matters which go to the very root of this

question of national morale and post-war reconstruction. They will be thoroughly discussed, I assure you, in the course of these broadcasts, as we go on.

What we need to bear in mind just now is Oliver Cromwell's historic exhortation to his troops: "Trust in God and keep your powder dry." In the rain soaked English climate, it was all too easy for the troops to allow their powder to become damp through carelessness and inefficiency—and damp powder meant defeat.

There is a lesson in that for us today. We must not allow carelessness, bungling, indifference nor inefficiency to jeopardize the outcome of the great issues which are being fought today.

With faith in God, we must insist that efficiency directed towards ensuring victory in both war and in peace shall be the order of the day. And, ladies and gentlemen, it is no use just talking about these matters.

In a democracy the people—you and I and our fellow Canadians—are responsible for everything done in this country. If matters are not being handled as they should be in any direction, it is our solemn responsibility to see that it is put right. By assuming this supreme duty of democratic citizenship, we shall be giving evidence of our faith in God and of the spiritual power which must precede our efficiency in the conduct of our material affairs.

I appeal to you older men, who prob-

ably fought in the last war and who are not physically fit to go at this time. I appeal to you, mothers and fathers, you brothers and sisters whose loved one are in the battle-line. I appeal to all our public spirited citizens who want to see poverty banished from a land of plenty, who want to see the ravages of unemployment, enormous debts and burdensome taxes done away with. I appeal to all, young and old, rich and poor, who feel that a people should be able to enjoy the fruits of their own labors. It is up to us to make Canada what it should be.

I have no hesitation in saying that in setting our hands to the task of building that Canada, we shall be forging the most powerful weapon to ensure victory in war—the invincible weapon of a people so united in purpose that their morale is proof against any and every adversity.

May God grant that we shall tackle this task and be true to ourselves.

THE RETURNED SOLDIER PROBLEM

There is a good old song that comes to my mind just now, entitled, "When Johnny Comes Marching Home." We used to sing it during the Boer War, and even more lustily during the last war. It was a gay sort of tune about all the good times we were going to have when the world had been made safe for democracy. Somehow or other we didn't have those good times. They didn't materialize. We could have had them but we didn't, and it took us years to find out, that though we had won the war, we had been cheated out of winning the peace.

Well, we can all have good times after this war if we get busy and do something about it **now**; if we prepare in the present to meet the problems which will confront us when our brave fighters come back home. Let us examine, for a moment or

two, one of the problems we may expect to face.

Isn't it perfectly obvious that two of the chief problems, will involve our returned veterans and our farmers or primary producers. After this, there will be matters such as transferring from war time to peace time production, unemployment, national health, the extension of social services, and security measures, more particularly involving a complete reform of our financial system.

What I fear is that these great problems will all fall upon us suddenly like huge chunks of coal tumbling down the coal chute, and we will do well to save our scalps, let alone do anything to solve the problems. We are fortunate indeed that we have the opportunity to study these right now, one after the other, so that we will know what to do and will be ready to cope with each situation effectively when it occurs. I am sure you will all see that.

Well now, let us start our task by considering the first problem, that of rehabilitating and providing for our returned soldiers. The men and women of our fighting forces have been drawn from every branch of industry, of commerce and of professional life. And yet, would you believe it, even without their assistance we have risen to new heights of production. Without them we have grown greater crops of all kinds than ever before. Without the labor of those who are now in our

fighting forces, we have produced more livestock and dairy produce than we have ever done before. Without the skill and the effort of those whose energies have been commandeered to put down this madman, Hitler, and his henchmen, we have increased production from our factories, from our steel mills, and from other industrial plants to an extent which is almost unbelievable.

In the ship building industry alone, according to a prominent American authority, we have increased the out-put 300% since 1939, but we are now using only one-sixth of the man-power we used in that year.

Think that over for a moment! We are turning out three times the shipping tonnage of 1939, but we are using only one-sixth of the man-power to do it.

We are, of course, experiencing a shortage of man-power at the present time, but the cold fact is that we are still producing more than we have ever produced before.

The question, therefore, arises, "Will it be necessary for every man Jack of our fighting forces to get back into industry and business after this war?" And the answer to that question is, "Certainly not! The idea is preposterous". In fact, radio friends, those who have given thought to the problem declare emphatically that the essential feature of the present problem is not to see that every man and woman, young or old is put to

work. We must recognize that the supreme function of the social order in modern times is to insure that production is maintained at the highest possible level and equitably distributed in a manner such as to provide security and freedom for all. I should like you to get this. It is a vital principle of the new social order.

Remember, production was never intended as a means of providing work. The primary and only function of production is to provide a decent standard of living, or if you like, the removal of poverty from the midst of plenty.

The irrevocable trend of modern progress has been and will continue to be toward decreasing the man-power necessary to operate industries. Today one man presses a button here, another moves a lever over there, and one of those marvelous power-driven machines of scientific invention immediately does the work. After this war there will be a button to press the buttons and move the levers.

The scientific harnessing of solar energy will force us to make the proper use of the leisure time which it is pressing upon us. So why should our splendid, magnificent fighting heroes who have offered a sacrifice of all that is dear to them, be sentenced to hard labor for life, while we throw the machines away? I submit that that is not a very sensible solution to this problem.

I shall offer you a proposal in a few minutes, but before doing so, I should like

you to consider another aspect of the question. You know, if we understand fully all the aspects of a question, we will then be able to judge whether or not the answer is adequate.

I think you will agree with me that the debt we owe to the heroes of our Navy, our Merchant Marine, our Air Force, our Army and the members of our auxiliary services, transcends every other debt claim which arises out of this war. Our first consideration, therefore, must be for them. Our first duty must be on their behalf. If we can't settle the problem of the Returned Men we will not be able to solve any of them. All right then, let us acknowledge the immensity of the debt we owe them.

Furthermore, let us not forget that the men and women of our fighting forces are very properly looking to the people at home to see that they return to a Canada worthy of the unstinting sacrifices they are making. Those men and women have a right to expect that we will acknowledge our debt to them in terms of action, and not merely in terms of high sounding, but vapid praise.

It is perfectly clear, therefore, that if the debt we owe our fighting forces is more important than any other debt claim arising out of this war and if they have a right to expect that we acknowledge our debt, as surely as the others will demand that we acknowledge our debts to them, then we must give very serious considera-

tion to the minimum standards which should be set for the payment of the debt claim to the heroes of this war. We have set minimum interest rates and terms of payment for our money debt to the financial institutions, haven't we? Then why not set the minimum of our standard of payment to our fighting heroes?

Here, then, are several practical proposals which I am offering for your consideration and approval. I think it is the least we should do.

On demobilization, persons who have served in the armed forces or the merchant marine, shall continue to receive full pay and allowances including subsistence of a private in the Army, for a period of not less than three years and also until the individual has been established satisfactorily in the economic life of the country.

Furthermore, after the three years of paying full pay and allowances to our fighting forces and merchant marine, the Returned men should receive a monthly income from the state, irrespective of any income they may earn. I repeat, after the three-year period, they should receive a monthly income from the state sufficient to ensure adequate basic economic security for the family against loss of income through any cause whatsoever.

These men are risking their lives daily in order that we may live in security. Does that not entitle them to spend the rest of their lives in the security for which they are risking everything? I think so.

Immediately, no doubt, I will be asked, "Where is the money coming from? Where will we get the money to continue full pay and allowances for three years to our armed forces and the merchant marine?" Look here, my friend, you should surely hesitate to ask me such a question. "Have we not already paid full pay and allowances for more than three years?"

If we could pay these during the past three years, and at the same time produce billions of dollars worth of war materials to hurl at the Nazis, why should anyone doubt that we could continue to pay our fighting forces for three years after this war, when our industries will be changed from war time to peace time production of an abundance of goods for our own use?

I have no hesitation in asserting most emphatically, ladies and gentlemen, that if we use the proper method of financing, we shall be able to fulfill our obligation to those who have risked all to save us from totalitarian domination, without running the country into colossal and needless staggering financial debt burdens such as we are piling up at the present. We must decide whether we are going to play fair with our brave fighters or submit to the dictates of the money monopolists.

But that isn't all. What about the men or women who have been disabled? Should we not in all fairness pay to them disability pensions in addition to the provisions I have already just mentioned. These dis-

ability pensions should be granted to all cases of disablement from any cause whatever during service in the armed forces or in the merchant marine. Surely common justice and fairplay will compel that action even apart from the Christian gratitude that should fill our hearts.

But that does not, even yet, take care of all the debt we owe our fighting heroes. Nor does it set the minimum standard of our effort to pay the debt we owe. Grants should be provided, in addition to pay and allowances and pensions, for the purpose of acquiring land, for becoming established in business or for getting set up in any other remunerative undertaking which requires capital.

Remember, my friends, this is only just and fair, for while we have been at home carrying on own businesses and our professions, the heroes of our fighting forces and the merchant marine have been sacrificing their opportunities to establish themselves in the business enterprises and in the professions of our country. They must not be denied the opportunity of becoming established after this war. Our sense of justice should demand that we give them the opportunity they have sacrificed on our behalf.

And then, what about the dependents of those who have been killed or who have died on active service? It is clear to us all, that if these dependents have lost their bread-winners, their fathers and their sons, we owe them a debt which we can never

hope fully to repay. The least we can do for them (I mean for the dependents of those who have been killed)—should be to provide them with a pension equivalent to the full pay and allowances, including subsistence, during the lifetime of the mother or widow, or, in the case of children, until they become 18 years of age or have finished their educational training. This should apply also to the dependents of men who have been invalided out of the service and who have subsequently died.

These, my radio friends, are my suggestions regarding the problem of the returned soldiers. I give them to you for your consideration and approval. Let me hear from you.

Someone may say that it looks as if I am suggesting that we give our heroes the whole world with a silk ribbon around it. Let me tell you, my friend, they will have given **us** the whole world of freedom after they win this war. Yes, they will actually have won a better world for us. Then why not let us see that they enjoy the world which they have won at such tremendous sacrifice? It can be done, my friends, as surely as this war can and will be won. It can be done if we go about it in the right way.

Moreover, in meeting our obligations to our fighting forces, bear in mind we will be ensuring that we shall have a better Canada for everyone else.

PROBLEMS OF AGRICULTURE

Following last weeks broadcast on the important question of rehabilitating our fighting men after the war, I received many interesting letters. These contained a number of very worthwhile suggestions, and I wish to thank all of you who wrote.

I appreciate the fact that for the most part, our proposals regarding the rehabilitation of our fighting men, are meeting with your general approval. However, there was one point which seems to have been misunderstood, and I wish to clear this up tonight. In suggesting that the minimum measure of economic security for our returned soldiers, sailors and airmen should be full pay and all allowances, including subsistence, I was, of course, referring to the basic scale applicable to a

private in the army. In other words all should be treated alike. Surely any other arrangement would be most inequitable.

Tonight, radio friends, I propose to discuss another very vital aspect of Post-War Reconstruction — namely: “What About Agriculture?”

I gave this broadcast special announcement last week because I was anxious to have a large number of farmers and ranchers listening. I wanted to get their definite opinion of it. While my remarks concern the farmers and ranchers particularly, I want to direct them to our business and professional men as well. In my estimation there is no person—no matter what his occupation may be, whose economic security—yes, whose general welfare—is not closely linked to agriculture in some of its various aspects.

Too often we glibly say: “Yes indeed, agriculture is our basic industry and the very foundation of our national economy”; and then we stand by and allow the most disgraceful farming conditions to exist without the slightest protest whatever. That does not seem consistent.

Listen to me, men and women. When I contemplate the plight of our farmers—debt-ridden, forced to sell their products below production costs, denied the amenities which town and city dwellers take for granted, and obliged to work long hours under great handicaps, I wonder whether our business and professional men, our factory workers, our merchants and others,

really recognize what the welfare of agriculture means to them?

I ask myself: "If they do, then why don't they take a stand? Surely they realize that so long as the farmer is getting such unfair, irresponsible and wretchedly disastrous treatment, it reacts to the detriment of every worker in every other industry—yes, of every citizen in our land?"

I do not need to point out that without agriculture there would be no other industry. That is self-evident. We all know that it was the first industry and that our whole elaborate civilization with its many other branches of industrial activity have all been developed from agriculture. It is the corner-stone of our national life; and I think we should all recognize that unless we have a virile and flourishing agriculture, we cannot have a prosperous Canada.

I therefore claim most emphatically that in laying the foundations of a new Post-War order, we must start with agriculture—because that is **the basic** foundation of our entire economic structure. I urge you, who have not given this aspect of the matter much attention, to think this over very carefully, for it concerns us all vitally.

Now, let us face the problems of agriculture as they are pressing themselves upon us today.

I take it that the first and most urgently pressing problem which is threatening to wreck agriculture is that of **the**

unsatisfactory prices of farm products. For years our farmers have been forced to sell their products at prices which have been actually below production costs. Do we realize what that means? It means that for years our farmers have been producing food for us all, and actually being out-of-pocket for doing so. In other words, they have been treated little better than serfs. In fact, ladies and gentlemen, in some respects they have been worse off than serfs were under the feudal system. At least the serfs did not have to go deeper and deeper into debt in order to keep on producing for their feudal lords, and they were not harassed by threats of foreclosure.

You surely are aware of the devastating effect of the low prices which our farmers have been getting. Some of them, in order to acquire and operate their farms, have been obliged to borrow money.

Let us follow this through for a moment: A wheat farmer borrowed \$2,000 at 8% interest when wheat was \$1.40 a bushel. When the price of wheat slumped to 70 cents (actually it went much lower—but even at 70 cents)—that farmer had to sell twice as much wheat to meet his debt obligations. In other words the result was exactly the same as though his interest had been increased to 16% on the basis of his original debt, or as though the principal had been increased to \$4,000 at 8%; and in addition the resulting fall in land values robbed him of his equity in his farm. Surely this is quite a jolt to get in a few

short years. We have said nothing about crop losses, due to drought or hail. He has to bear the brunt of all these also.

Now, wait a moment! His actual position is even worse than that. When wheat was \$1.40 he was able to meet his production costs and have a margin over to pay debt obligations and provide for his living expenses. But at 70 cents he is lucky if he can meet his costs of production. He has no margin—and so though his debt has doubled he has no means of meeting the increased burden. He is therefore forced to go on getting deeper and deeper into debt.

But that is not all: There is another catch about the whole arrangement. The price he gets is subject to deduction for the freight charges of carrying his grain to Fort William. So that the farther west he lives the more heavily he is penalized. And not only does he get less for his wheat according to the distance he farms from Fort William, but he is forced to pay more for everything he buys. You see he has the freight both ways to face. Can you imagine a more unjust and fantastically stupid arrangement? Why should we allow this to continue? There then, briefly, is the nature of the price problem we have to tackle.

Now how shall we remedy it? What just and equitable basis must we establish to secure satisfactory farm prices?

The farmer, himself, has given us the answer: All he wants is a system of prices which will put him on the same footing as

our manufacturing industrialists. The farmer would be satisfied with prices for his products which will cover his production costs and give him a return for his services comparable with other industries. I take that to be fair and reasonable, and I am ready to stand for it;

So the first essential step is to raise the prices of farm products, **at the point of delivery**, so that they are on a parity with the average prices of manufactured goods.

Furthermore, our farmers must be given the assurance that they are producing what is actually wanted in the required quantities. Instead of the old haphazard way of carrying on, we must establish a definite and orderly long range policy for crop and livestock production. Our farmers and ranchers should have complete information as to probable future markets.

Then, too, it is essential that farmers should have access to adequate low cost credit in order to produce efficiently—I mean both long term and short term credit. Though they have been moving in that direction in the United States, we have nothing remotely approaching satisfactory arrangements for agriculture in Canada as yet.

I'm not through yet: Closely bound up with the question of prices and proper credit facilities is the problem of farm debts. Ah! there's the rub! I have every confidence in the great majority of the farmers in Canada. Given the means to meet their just debt obligations, our farm-

ers would be scrupulously anxious to discharge their liabilities. I do not fear contradiction when I say, there is no more inherently honest group of people in Canada than the farmers. But much of the huge debt burden pressing upon them at present is neither fair nor just—in fact it is crudely inhuman or devilish. As I have already shown you, much of these debts have been piled up as a result of causes beyond the farmers' control and of exorbitant interest. Common justice demands that they alone should not be expected to shoulder this accumulated burden due to conditions which have already penalized them so heavily.

So I submit that there will have to be a proper and equitable re-adjustment and settlement of all farm debts. We might as well make up our minds about this matter, ladies and gentlemen. It can be done, and it must be done—that is all there is to it—it is up to us to see that it is done.

There are just two more major matters with which I wish to deal tonight. The first of these is to stress the need of providing adequate marketing facilities for farm products, under conditions which will protect the farmer from the manipulation of prices by vested interests and from the evils of monopoly control over the marketing of his produce. I am confident that there will be general agreement on this, and therefore I do not need to elaborate on the urgent necessity for action along these lines.

Finally as the basis for a reconstructed agriculture, I submit that the whole system of land tenure must be revised. Hear me carefully! Land is the greatest asset of any community and it should be recognized as a sacred trust. We should not allow it to be abused simply to benefit the few at the expense of the people as a whole, by permitting gambling in land values, unrestricted exploitation and monopoly control. These must be curbed. The owner or tenant of land must be assured security of tenure if he is to be expected to fulfil his trust. His investment must be protected; and the community too must be saved from land grabbing by large concerns who speculate for the purpose of keeping it out of production, or of working it with little better than slave labour, or perhaps of holding it to unload at greatly enhanced prices—and all that type of parasiting on legitimate agriculture.

The ghastly consequences of unrestricted land exploitation and wild card gambling in land values are apparent on every hand in Canada today. We must put an end to it.

I am satisfied, ladies and gentlemen, that we can establish a sound scheme of land tenure which will preserve all the benefits and advantages of private ownership for the occupant, give him adequate security of tenure and at the same time eliminate all the obnoxious features of the present system.

I claim that we must be ready to

meet these problems now while there is yet time. We must be prepared to welcome our victorious fighting forces bac to a Canada worthy of them. Just as they are smashing through to victory in the face of tremendous obstacles, so must we at home break down all resistance and indifference to keep faith with them by rising above the difficulties and problems which we face in doing this essential job. So let us get busy and co-operate to that end.

NATIONAL HEALTH IN THE POST-WAR ORDER

When a person has the misfortune to find that his house is on fire, he rushes to the phone and summons the fire brigade. He does not stop to ask: "Can I afford to call the fire brigade? Will I ever be able to pay the cost if I do? Would it be cheaper to let the place burn down?" No! He knows that the experienced fire fighters are at his service because he is a citizen, and this expert service has been provided by the State to help him in case of need.

Is it not strange that if this same person is stricken with an illness, he is in an entirely different position? A long period in hospital or an expensive operation may be necessary to restore him to health, but before he calls for this expert assistance, he has to figure out whether he can meet the expense or not. More than that, he has to face the probable handicap of losing his

income because he cannot go to work. Disaster confronts him and his family no matter what happens. If he does not receive proper medical treatment he faces death. If he does receive the necessary care, then he will be financially crippled for years—probably the rest of his life—trying to repay the cost of the medical attention which he received.

Is it not a shameful reflection on our social system that where the home is in peril from fire, we have made full provision to rush help to the unfortunate occupant, **irrespective of his means**, but when his health is in danger then all the knowledge and skill of our healing services are available to him only **if he can afford to pay for them**? Do we really place a higher value upon mere buildings than we do upon the physical welfare of our citizens? I submit that we have to face this question fairly and squarely for it is one of the many indefensible and obnoxious freaks of the old tottering, inadequate, unreasonable system of social injustice.

Now this evening I propose to discuss the vitally important subject of "The People's Health in the Post-War Order", and to place before you a general health policy for your careful consideration.

There is an unfortunate tendency today in many quarters to approach this matter from the negative view-point. By that I mean that too much emphasis is being placed on the treatment of **sickness and ill-health**, while too little regard is being paid

to the positive angle of sickness prevention and the preservation of health.

Everyone of us knows how precious good health is to us and our loved ones. It is essential to the enjoyment of a full and happy life. With a strong physique and radiant health, there is a zest about everything we do. We work better. We enjoy our food. We get pleasure from our surroundings. We sleep well. We are better neighbours; better husbands and fathers; better mothers and wives; better citizens. Life is good. Difficulties are more easily overcome and happiness is not so elusive.

Now what is true of the individual is true of the Nation, for, as you well know, the Nation is simply the sum total of the individuals who comprise it. You cannot have a happy, contented and healthy Nation unless its individual citizens are happy, contented and healthy. Surely that is self-evident. And, similarly, the extent to which the work and life of individual citizens is impaired by ill-health, is also the extent to which the national well-being will suffer.

We must bear in mind that the whole basis of our social life under a democracy is, by association, to ensure that the people gain the greatest possible economic security with a maximum of freedom. But if the system we operate decrees that when a person is ill and cannot work, his income ceases, and yet he must meet the cost of any treatment he needs, the individual lacks the necessary economic security

which he should enjoy, and he lives in constant fear of being ill. Hence, where there is no security there can be little freedom in the true sense. That is incompatible with a proper democratic order.

So the nation as a whole has a responsibility to its individual citizens in sickness—the responsibility to ensure that when they are ill, they will obtain proper care and treatment, and that their family will be assured at least basic economic security.

But that is only one aspect of the matter.

The individual too, has a responsibility to the Nation. Because his ill-health, impairs his contribution to the national welfare and reacts against his fellows, it is not only in his own interest, but it is his solemn obligation, as a citizen, to maintain himself in that conclusion. Our individual responsibility is as great as our claim.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, to tackle this problem of National Health we should first know the more important causes of ill-health.

I submit that the first and greatest cause of ill-health is, unquestionably, economic. Poverty and a condition of persistent insecurity, inevitably result in worry, sickness and disease. Poverty and improper nourishment go hand in hand. Economic insecurity and worry are likewise inseparable and deadly partners. And when a large section of a Nation is in the clutches of these economic monsters, coupled with

an overwhelming fear for the future, the National morale deteriorates, health preservation is pushed into the background, and amidst the scurry and desperate struggle to get a mere existence, exercise and essential recreation are neglected. No wonder we are such a sickly lot!

But that is not all: Next in the causes of sickness comes the lack of **health knowledge**. Considering the pre-eminent importance of preserving good health, we devote pitifully little attention to passing on to our people essential knowledge about keeping healthy. And the reason? Let us be frank with ourselves. It is because under conditions of widespread poverty and general economic distress, it would be useless to tell people what they should do. They simply could not carry it out if we did.

Now then, ladies and gentlemen, without a shadow of doubt the first essential step in dealing with the health of the people is to remove the chief causes of sickness. Poverty must be abolished and the individual citizen must be assured basic economic security for himself and his family. This means that he must be assured of an income sufficient to maintain the home if he is unemployed, ill, or disabled, and that his anxiety about his retirement from work must be removed by the guarantee of an adequate pension. These social dividends will eliminate the evils of poverty, economic insecurity, and fear.

Then when this is done, every citizen must be assured access to the best possible

sickness preventive measures and and, if he becomes ill, he should be able to have all the necessary and available diagnostic, curative, hospital and sanatorium services, **irrespective of his means.** We must put sickness prevention and cure on a basis of an essential social service.

Let me continue: There are two ways in which this can be done. The first is under what is popularly known as Compulsory State Insurance schemes. This involves the setting up of a government bureaucracy which compels wage earners and others to contribute to a central fund, out of which doctors and hospitals are paid to treat those contributors who are ill. I can see some very strong objectives to this idea. In the first place, the compulsory contributions levied upon wage earners are nothing more nor less than a wage tax which reduces the economic security of the individual, renders him less able to maintain a healthy standard of living, and adds to his worries. This in turn must have a detrimental effect upon his health.

In the second place, the contributions levied on employers to help supply the money are carried into prices, and the people least able to bear the cost have to foot the bill. It is just another way of putting the burden on the poor benighted consumer.

Moreover, government authorities who carry out this scheme very rapidly become a bureaucracy, issuing thousands of

regulations and sending out all kinds of inspectors, snooping into everybody's business. Also, in a very short time, patients, doctors and hospital authorities find themselves being regimented and subjected to all kinds of restrictions and annoyances. Initiative becomes crushed, freedom is destroyed, and efficiency stifled by a suffocating bureaucracy. It doesn't sound good to me, I tell you. Far from it improving anybody's health, I am convinced that such a system will ultimately lead to friction, worry, less security for everybody and further deterioration in health.

The other way of making proper health services available to the people is to institute a non-contributory system under which the individual, whatever his means may be, is assured of access, not only to the necessary curative services, but to the best possible sickness preventive knowledge and facilities which can be made available. He would be free to choose his own doctor, and at the same time, doctors, hospitals and others providing health services would likewise be free to use their initiative in providing the best possible services without interference from, and domination by, a lot of government bureaucrats continually interfering with them.

That is the democratic, and I submit, the better way of dealing with this problem. However, you will immediately realize that to carry out such a national health program, it will be necessary for the Government which has the control of national

finances to provide adequate grants to meet the cost. And that, ladies and gentlemen, brings us back to the same old question which crops up whenever we discuss any reform. Where will the money come from?

As I pointed out before, this war has shown us that when we are faced with stark realities, there is no real problem in finding money to finance any undertaking, and providing that after this war, our monetary system is properly adjusted to meet the requirements, of an economy of abundance in which the vast resources of Canada will be used to distribute the maximum security to everyone, the problem of financing health services will present no great difficulties. The point is, we must agree to progressive measures of monetary reform, and the problem can be solved.

Next, I wish to draw your attention to a very serious anomaly in our whole attitude towards the doctors, dentists, nurses, etc.,—those responsible for relieving sickness and for helping us to maintain our health. We must bear in mind that the main objective of Medical Science is to provide us with the knowledge and the facilities for preserving good health, and the treatment of our illnesses should be only secondary to this. Yet we place doctors and others responsible for this important aspect of our national life in the unenviable position of paying them only to cure us when we are ill. I submit that in the national health system of the

Post-War Order, we should progressively introduce the principle of payment for keeping us well. Is it a just or a reasonable attitude to expect men to devote their lives to medical science and research for the main purpose of keeping us healthy, and then penalize them for the success they achieve by paying them only when we are ill? Does it seem the right thing that any of our medical experts should be forced to profit only by the misfortunes of others?

I have one more matter to bring to your attention. I suggest that the time is long overdue for us to recognize that the promotion of physical culture (body development in all its branches) should be an essential aspect of our national life. By physical culture I do not mean a system of mass regimentation such as the term implies in totalitarian countries, but rather the various health recreations and facilities for helping persons to maintain fine, sturdy, well-developed and healthy bodies, without which their physique tends to deteriorate.

There, then, are my submissions for your consideration. I urge you to get together with your friends, study these problems, then write to me giving me the benefit of your views so that together we can arrive at a common basis of agreement which will reflect the will of the people. I want you to feel that these are **your** broadcasts, and that as we progress, they will more and more reflect your views.

UNEMPLOYMENT, WORK AND WAGES

I have noted recently that the public is being told a great deal about **"full employment"** being the supreme objective of our Post-War order. They refuse to make any allowance whatever for leisure time, culture or meditation. I wonder why they take such a rigid stand as that in this enlightened age?

As I reflect upon the state of affairs which existed before the war, I recall that in practically every country there was a huge unemployment problem. During those years, economists, politicians and financiers were all concentrating on what they called "curing unemployment". But only in one country did they make a complete job of it. That was in Nazi Germany under Hitler. He found work for about eight million unemployed. Where previous

governments had failed miserably to cure the German unemployment problem, Hitler and his gang dealt with it rather summarily, but effectively, in a very short time. They did it by the simple method of mass regimentation. The people became the mere creatures of the State. They were put to work building military highways; goose-stepping up and down parade grounds; building munition factories, and factories to turn out uniforms by the millions, and war planes by the thousands. The entire country was turned into a Slave State in which everybody did what he was told or suffered the consequences. And thus the objective of curing unemployment was achieved. But, Oh my! At what a terrible price!

Today, not only Europe, but the whole world is paying in blood, misery, and desolation because of Hitler's method of dealing with Germany's unemployment problem. And as we look back, is it not plain that from the moment that he embarked on his mad adventure war became inevitable? Are we to attempt measures which will perpetuate the same things in the future? I claim that it is clearly evident that, but for the millions of men, he forced into uniform, in spite of the huge increases in Germany's production during those fateful pre-war years, unemployment would **not** have been eliminated. There was not enough work with ordinary commercial production to accomplish that.

Do we not see that as soon as we, of the Democratic Countries, were forced to adopt the same policy of putting the flower of our manhood into uniform, and stepping up our industrial production to provide them with equipment in order to stop Hitler's insane campaign of conquest, our unemployment problem disappeared also, almost over night? Previous to that it had settled like a fog over our depressed civilization.

With these facts so vividly in our minds, are we justified in accepting the view that **full employment for everybody**—by which is meant, of course, full employment in industry and commerce without a war—is going to be possible after this war is over? Is it not a factor to be wondered at, that the men who are most vociferous in pressing this view upon us at the present time, are the very ones who failed so miserably to deal with the pre-war unemployment problem? Now tell me, if they failed then, is it likely they will succeed after this war? On what grounds do you base any hope of success in that way?

Well, it is around this matter that my talk tonight will be centred, for I propose to discuss "Unemployment, Work and Wages in the Post-War period." I claim that our whole system is due for a drastic overhauling.

You all know something about ancient Greece. It provides one of the most glorious chapters in human history. In the arts, in education, in health knowledge,

and in many other ways, the contribution which ancient Greece made to the progress of civilization was unique. In some respects it has never been surpassed.

Those wonderful achievements were the combined results of its democratic system of government and of the leisure time enjoyed by its citizens. The advancement in the arts, the games for which they became famous, and the riches of knowledge which they gave to the world could not have been developed, if the people had been occupied all the time—growing food, building homes and scrambling unceasingly for an insecure livelihood. The cultural progress which they enjoyed was made possible only because they had leisure time and, under their democratic system they were allowed the freedom necessary for self-expression and the development of initiative in everyday life.

That is worthy of note, but there was one very ugly feature about the civilization of ancient Greece. It was built on a foundation of **slave labour**. The leisure and the freedom which its citizens enjoyed were made possible only by the slaves who did most of the hard manual work. Grecian Culture and Civilization depended upon the reliability and character of the human slaves upon which these rested. Therein lay its weakness.

Now there is a profound lesson for us in the story of ancient Greece. Great as were the achievements of the wonderful period, they are as nothing compared to

the opportunities we have at our command today. "The glory which was found in Greece" was made possible by its slave labour of perhaps four or five slaves to a family. On the North American Continent alone we have at our disposal the equivalent of over fifty slaves each to do the bidding of every man, woman and child, and what is more, they are mechanical slaves. They never tire nor rebel. These power driven machines which for years have been developed, improved and applied over and ever widening field to take the place of human labour in the production and distribution of goods should be at the disposal of our people. Furthermore, this process has been going on for nearly two hundred years, since, in the endeavour to overcome scarcity, mankind discovered how to harness the energy of the sun stored up in coal and oil, and with it to drive machines which would do the work for him. In that short space of time he has succeeded to such an extent that one man watching a machine can today actually perform what formerly it would have taken a hundred men or more to produce.

Thus the whole trend of production in modern times has been to eliminate progressively the need for manual labour in industry, and to replace manpower by machines.

Is it any wonder then, ladies and gentlemen, that we had an unemployment problem before the war? The whole purpose of power-driven machinery is to

create unemployment. We call it labor-saving machinery. It is quite evident that with every improvement in our mechanical devices and efficient methods, our ability to produce is increased, but industry's capacity to employ men is reduced.

Surely then, as these vast power-driven machines make it possible to produce more and more, with less and less human labour, everybody should be better off. The people generally should reap the benefit. We should have an increasing supply of goods with less work to do. In other words, we should all be more secure and have a greater amount of leisure time—infinitely more than anything which was possible in ancient Greece.

Now, it is at this point in the consideration of this question, that we must face an amazing and fantastically stupid barrier we have set up against enjoying the benefits of all this progress.

We have decreed that the only manner in which anybody can obtain any of the goods which our vast army of power-driven mechanical slaves help to produce, is by means of a ticket called money. And this money system has been so arranged, so manipulated, that the only manner in which the majority of the people can obtain a money income is in return for work in the production of goods.

So you see what we are doing. On the one hand we are saying that unless a man works within the economic system he will get no money. Then we proceed to devise

effective ways of replacing the need for human toil by improved machinery so that he cannot get a job. Finally we tell him that he cannot have the goods which the machine is producing without his help because he has no money. What is the poor fellow to do under such a system? Could anything be more insane or unfair than that? Now what we really need is some good, forthright common-sense in dealing with this problem in the Post-War Order.

I submit that the first and basic need is to recognize that the true purpose of employment **is not to provide persons with incomes** but to produce goods and services for our use.

Therefore **full production and not full employment** should be our objective.

That leads me to the second point. Because power-driven machines are progressively replacing manpower from industry, and men can no longer rely upon employment for incomes, payment for work should **not** be the only means of distributing purchasing power. We must find other ways. **The greater security and the increasing leisure made possible by improved production methods must be distributed to the people as a whole in some equitable fashion.**

But how shall this be done? Well, in the first place, wages and salaries must be established on an adequate basis, so as to provide the maximum inducement for people to do the needed, though diminishing work. Workmen must be well paid.

Furthermore, we must ensure that if a man is displaced by a machine, or if he is sick and cannot go to work, or if he is disabled, he and his family will not be rendered destitute. And more than that, every citizen must have the assurance that when he is past the working age he will be adequately provided for in his old age.

In order to do this, we should guarantee every citizen that, apart from his wages or salary, he will receive a basic income sufficient to assure him and his family economic security, with freedom, in unemployment, sickness, disability or old age. And these benefits should increase with greater production, as the machines continue to displace manpower.

That will distribute the security which our mechanical slaves are capable of providing.

But we must also distribute the resulting leisure and culture brought to us by them. This can be done in several ways:

First, we can extend the period of education and of preparatory training for careers. That is at one end of the scale. At the other end we can progressively reduce the retirement age.

Next, we can reduce the hours during which men work in industry and commerce, thus giving them more leisure for other pursuits.

Then, we can divert more and more of our attention to the development of cultural pursuits—the arts, sciences, religion, meditation, and so forth.

With each liberation from the bondage of slavery, it is important to bear in mind that we must give proper attention to providing facilities for the use of all the increasing leisure along lines which will enrich the national culture, strengthen morale and make for the well-being of all.

And finally, ladies and gentlemen, we must ensure that the rights of labour are more completely recognized than is possible today.

Well, there you are, what do you think of these proposals? I hope you all can see that the present system needs a real overhauling. My proposals are not what you would call revolutionary for they need not upset the general trend of affairs. They are just plain common-sense measures for dealing with a far-reaching and revolutionary event in human history, namely the advent of a vast army of mechanical slaves to serve mankind? This is what the surgeons might call a major operation to adjust the body politic to growing conditions that have developed.

When you view the matter from these angles, it becomes very plain that the futile and inadequate ways in which we are trying to tinker with the problem by means of the palliatives of compulsory unemployment insurance schemes, and impossible plans of trying to create full employment after the war, are useless, stupid, ineffective, puerile and even basically revolutionary in tendency, because they ignore the real facts, and they place the human race

in an impossible position with their backs against the wall. What do we expect they will do if those things are continued?

I want you to think over what I have said, ladies and gentlemen. Discuss it with your friends and then write, giving me your views.

Broadcast No. 8

SOME QUESTIONS ANSWERED

You will recall that I have covered four aspects of post-war reconstruction in the previous broadcasts. The first talk dealt with the problem of providing for our returned fighting men. I suggested that nothing less than the assurance of economic security, with freedom for them and for their dependents would suffice. To this end I put forward certain definite proposals which included:

First, that on demobilization the men of our fighting forces should receive not less than full pay and allowances, including subsistence, for a private in the army, for a period of three years to assist them in establishing themselves in the economic life of the country, and that thereafter they should continue to receive a basic income sufficient to provide them and their dependents with security in sickness, disability, unemployment or old age.

Second, definite provisions for the dependents of the men who die while serving with the Armed Forces and of those who may die subsequently.

I have had a lot of favorable comment on that broadcast. They say, surely that is the least we can do for those who have done so much for us.

The next broadcast dealt with agriculture, and the proposals I submitted for your consideration included parity prices for farm products, proper marketing conditions for our primary producers, the provision of adequate agricultural credit (both long and short term), and an equitable settlement of farm debts. This was treated for the most part with enthusiastic acceptance. One or two wanted to know why I was concerned so much with the farmers who were well-looked-after at the present time.

The third talk was on the important subject of Health and, as in the previous discussions, I outlined a national health programme under which every Canadian would have access to proper medical, hospital and sickness prevention services. One writer from Ontario said, if I was in favor of doing so much for sick people, I should also be willing to meet the sacred obligations of bonded interest. Others did not see where all the money would come from. People do not change much, do they?

Last week we discussed "Unemployment, Work and Wages" in a reconstructed post-war economy; and I pointed out the need of distributing the security and the leisure made possible by our vast army of mechanical slaves—the huge power-driven machines which are progressively enabling us to produce more and more, with less and less human labour.

In all I have received a splendid res-

ponse. People are forming definite opinions for themselves. On both the broadcast dealing with agriculture, and the one in which I discussed the question of providing for our returned men, I received the greatest amount of comment. The greater number were about agriculture and came mostly from farmers. But we had also a good file of comment from returned men of the last war and from mothers and wives of our men overseas. I wish you could have read some of those letters. They would make your heart ache, for in simple words they would bring home to you, far more forcibly than anything I can say, the loneliness, the constant dread and the sorrow which many of these loyal people have been bearing in connection with the sacrifices of this war; and the hardships and problems of many of our farmers who are in constant fear of dispossession. I have been wondering how these same sacrificing citizens must have felt when they read the greatly publicized attack on what I had to say about our returned men? Would they feel that after all, a portion of the public did not appreciate their sacrifice?

I have tried to make it abundantly plain that the purpose of these broadcasts is to help the people of Canada to consider the whole question of post-war reconstruction, which is such an essential aspect of our national war effort. I am anxious that all Canadians should crystallize their collective desires in a definite, constructive and practical programme.

I think it must be clear to us all, that unless the overwhelming majority of the people are agreed on the kind of post-war order they want, there will be no reconstruction of our social system worthy of the name. Therefore, the first step must be to unite the people on the results they desire in common.

Surely it is plainly evident that the issues which are involved are national in scope and are above any petty pussillanimous political bickering or party political intrigue. And I assure you, ladies and gentlemen, that the only reason I have taken it upon myself, on behalf of the Democratic Monetary Reform Organization, to give these broadcast talks is because it is high time we face these issues and nobody else seems to be tackling the job. For more than three solid years we have been listening to much vague, indefinite, and futile skirmishings about a new post-war order, and we have had it impressed upon us that unless something is done before the war ends it will be too late. Yet nobody has come forward to give the people a vigorous, clear-cut lead in laying down a comprehensive and concrete programme for the kind of post-war reconstruction **they** want. And, in the meantime, the evils of the old discredited pre-war system are becoming more firmly entrenched than ever, and the future prospects of deliverance are more remote.

I would have been recreant to my trust if my whole nature did not resent the

general laissez faire attitude that seems to prevail, when so much depends on promptness and the clarity of our courageous actions and I deprecate the personal and unwarranted attack upon me in some sections of the press.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I wish to quote from this editorial attacking me for my vigorous stand on a fair deal for our returned fighting heroes. Listen:

"Those who are fighting this war are fighting for a new world ideal. Those who are sacrificing their loved ones are doing so with the belief that they are making a sacrifice for a better world. You do not need to offer these men three years free living after this war, for they are going to be too busy seeing that what they fought for is brought about. Nor do you try to catch votes by offering them such things. (Ah! Let me read on) . . . We believe we are right in thinking that these men in battledress are going into the hell of battle with the fire of freedom's fight in their eyes and hearts and not the thought that if and when they come back, Mr. Aberhart will give them three years free living if they are wise enough to vote him into the Federal House." What bunkum!

I tell you bluntly, ladies and gentlemen, that so long as that kind of negative, unwarranted and vicious political misrepresentation and slander are all that these newspapers can contribute towards the grave problems which are confronting us, we do not need to recall that historic in-

cident of enthroned irresponsibility—Nero fiddling while Rome burned. We have a worse spectacle right here in our so-called modern times.

Surely this erudite editor knows that in the last war to make the world safe for democracy, brave men gave their lives and brave women suffered the agonies of despair for similar ideals to these for which our fellow Canadians are fighting today! Their sacrifices and anxieties were just as sacred—and are today just as sacred—as are those of the courageous men and women who are bearing the brunt of this war. But when the war was over, when the fighting was done, and the men returned, did they get a chance of seeing that what they had fought for was brought about? No, indeed! They were quickly hustled out of the way and left to fend for themselves. Listen to me. As a nation we broke faith—I repeat, we broke faith—with those who died in Flanders fields. Surely no one can defend such treatment as that or be willing to have the same repeated.

This is how a British Columbia correspondent puts it in his letter. Let me quote:

“The Returned Men of World War No. 1 were promised everything before they came back, but when they did return, what did they get? A low-down, dirty, rotten deal—a deal which will always be an utter disgrace to any country or nation which calls itself Christian and civilized.

Why—the so-called savages and heathens treat their returned warriors with grace, respect and pride—which is a great contrast to the treatment which our men got after 1918. I agree with you, that **now** is the time to make ready for the return of our boys who take part over there in this war. Surely after a person has offered the highest sacrifice for his country, he should be worthy of a just, honest and fair reward. Let us not have the **Shame** and **Disgrace** of the past World War fall upon us again.”

Thank you, British Columbia. I believe you are expressing the sentiment of the great majority of our people.

Before passing on, I must refer briefly to a powerfully penned letter from another veteran of the last war. He writes from an Ontario hospital. In the course of a scathing condemnation of existing conditions, he makes a comment to which I feel impelled to refer. It is a challenge to everyone of us. This is what he says: “The underdog will always remain the underdog.”

Look here, my brave Ontario veteran of the last war: Let us be hopeful. Surely we will come to our senses some time. There must not be any underdogs in the Canada for which our men are fighting this war—and it is up to us on the home front to make sure of this. Underdogs! Is that what our boys are to be made? No, God forbid!

I am sure that I am speaking for the

overwhelming majority of you in saying **that**, and I might add, "**this** time we **must** keep faith with our fighting men.

Turning now to the large number of letters I have received on Agriculture, I was very pleased to find that there is complete agreement among our farmers on the measures which I suggested; and they have given their views in no uncertain terms. Here is a brief extract from one of the letters:

"Allow me to express to you as Secretary of an organization composed of over fifteen thousand bona fide farmers, my appreciation of the **realistic** and **comprehensive** address given by yourself over the radio . . ."

Thank you, Sir. Your commendation is appreciated.

There is another point also. Practically every correspondent stressed the desperate need for action now to alleviate farming conditions. I realize this. But the only way we shall get action is by the people as a whole assuming their responsibility as citizens of a democracy, and organizing to insist on obedience to their wishes. But before this can be done we must obtain agreement on a definite programme—otherwise everybody will be so busy disagreeing with his neighbour that nothing **will** get done. And, it is no good sitting back and leaving it to George. I was tipped off the other day that this George fellow was one of the first to enlist. He is busy finishing up this Hitler mess. We who

are left at home must get together and press forward without him. So let us line up and get busy. What say you?

None of the letters I received expressed any disagreement on the Health policies I suggested, nor did they raise any important points regarding it. I believe that it is being generally conceded that the health of our people is a greater obligation than the interest on our bonds.

It is perhaps too early for many letters to have reached us on my suggestion regarding "Unemployment, Work and Wages." However, there is just one question to which I would like to reply briefly. I certainly did not imply, as one correspondent seems to think, that we should continue to put up with the evil effects of unemployment. Now please listen to me carefully. What I stressed was the need for distributing both the increasing leisure and the increasing economic security which are being provided by our vast army of mechanical slaves—those huge power-driven machines which are progressively replacing human labour in the industrial field. And I pointed out that only in **that** way will we ever get rid of the evil effects of mass unemployment. Surely that must be evident.

And now, ladies and gentlemen, I find my time is up. I urge you to think over these questions we are discussing from week to week, and to write me. I am deeply sincere and I should like to have your interest and support in these matters.

Broadcast No. 9

WARTIME TO PEACETIME INDUSTRY

I am going to assume, at this time the viewpoint of a scientist or perhaps an experienced industrialist—or if you like, an efficient administrator. I am supposing that I have been given the task of dealing with the problems which will arise, of necessity, when we come to the period of transition from wartime to peacetime industry. Now, what should I do under those circumstances?

Well, I would first of all crystallize and establish clearly my objective. I would discover and set down the character and the extent of the task that lies ahead of me. For example, I am persuaded that three years after this war is over, we will need to provide for two million people in the Province of Alberta. That is nearly three times our present population. I would judge, therefore, that I would need

to ascertain what natural resources we had at our disposal, and after that to consider the ways and means of making these resources and others which we have not got and which must be imported, available to our people; so that each and every one of them would be able to secure a fair, or should I say, a decent standard of living.

Now I am not criticizing anyone when I say that the majority of the objectives that have thus far been suggested have been lamentably vague and indescribably short-sighted and purposeless.

It seems to me that any Committee entrusted with this grave responsibility should, of necessity if we are to make the progress required, have to deal at first with each Province separately—you know that the resources of each Province are controlled by the Provinces. In addition to this, in formulating our efficient objective, we should realize that we can never build upon the framework or machinery of the pre-war days. That has long ago been proven to be out-of-date and absolutely useless for the purpose for which it was intended to function.

To corroborate this, it may pay us to look back at the pre-war period for a moment. Those were the days to which we must never return if we hope to get along. I think I am right in saying that we all have discovered what the trouble was during that pre-war period. I think you will all agree that the weak spot in the link of our industrial and economic life

lay in the fact that the system broke down when it came to the distribution of goods and services. The condition of poverty in the midst of plenty continually gained ground against us. We were producing more than we could use of all the necessities of life, and **yet somewhere** in the system, there was a bottleneck which prevented the large majority of our people from having access to all the things they needed.

The bottleneck left a surplus of goods on the market, and that in turn reacted in producing an increasing number who were left unemployed. The curse of unemployment is that it leaves more people with less purchasing power, and thus the vicious circle threatens to clog up and destroy the whole system.

I claim, ladies and gentlemen, that until we solve the problem of unemployment and of recurring depressions, there is little use of discussing the change from wartime to peacetime conditions or anything else for that matter.

It seems to me that most of those listening to me just now know perfectly well that unemployment is primarily caused by a shortage of purchasing power which fails to remove the surplus goods from the shelves. I am sure that it is equally clear that depressions which are of the same family, are caused by a stringent withdrawal of credit or purchasing power from circulation by the Financial Manipul-

ators who are first, last and always out for no. 1.

I place before you then, first and fundamentally, the absolute necessity of injecting more purchasing power into the system in a proper scientific manner if we hope to succeed with any transition without unemployment and depression.

The financial system is anaemic and needs a carefully performed blood-transfusion of purchasing power. The temporary exuberance of the body politic when the increased distribution of purchasing power took place on account of the War, proves beyond a shadow of a doubt that this needs to be continued after the war if the patient is to get well.

But at another time I shall discuss this in more detail when I deal with the problem of inflation and deflation, the bogey of Black Magic. It is my contention then, that this increase of purchasing power is definitely preliminary and preparatory to the scientific transition from wartime to peacetime industries.

I shall suppose then, for the purpose of this broadcast, that this scientific transfusion of purchasing power has been carefully looked after by the experts. Now then what next?

I feel certain there is no question in the mind of any one of you regarding our ability to produce an abundance of everything we need to make life happy and to remove forever the haunting fear of want that has been a burden to mankind since

the earliest days of history. That is something which has been proven beyond question by the achievements of industry during this war. We have been able to increase our productive capacity in an amazing manner and we have done it with less manpower for comparative work than ever before.

I remind you of this because, you know, when a scientist decides definitely upon his objective as we have done, he begins to take stock of the things at his disposal and by the use of which he may achieve his objective. If he wants to build a new kind of washing machine he looks about him to find out what plant facilities he will need. He investigates to find out what materials he will be able to obtain. Well, so far as we are concerned, we know at the very outset that we have the plant facilities.

Of course our plant facilities and all the machinery in these plants or factories, are now being used for the production of engines and machinery of destruction. But their achievement in this regard proves beyond doubt that if we can produce in such amazing volume for destruction, we should see to it that, after the war, this production be continued for constructive rather than destructive purposes.

You can all see that it would be disastrous to industry and to the welfare of the people if our present industrial organization was allowed to collapse at the end of the war, but it will surely collapse unless the people are given the opportunity

of having sufficient purchasing power to be able to buy at once all the peace-time consumer goods that our factories can produce. I think that all Canadians will grasp the importance of being prepared for the transition period which is most certain to come.

In some quarters today you may hear the remark that this preparation is being made. They will tell you that by encouraging the people to save their money, under compulsory saving plans and in other ways, the Federal Government is preparing the people with purchasing power which will be released and which will therefore provide a cushion upon which our industries will be able to fall back during the transition period. If this proves to be the case, it will serve only those who are able to take advantage of it. But what about those worthy individuals in our fighting forces, for instance, who are unable to either invest in war bonds or savings certificates? What about the younger generation which is now leaving school and which must enter the employment market during the transition period? Have these people been able to take advantage of plans for putting their purchasing power in cold-storage for the duration? Indeed, on the other hand, all of you know that these are the very people upon whom will fall the tremendous burden of taxation to meet the loan obligations into which our system of creating debt has thrown us. Even if these people are employed at

present wage levels, their purchasing power will be reduced by taxation whether direct or indirect, even if merely to pay the interest charges upon the debts piled up by the nation.

And furthermore, it is surely evident that all the money borrowed on bonds and saving certificates cannot be made available when it is taxed out of the people! Money does not grow on trees. Candidly, men and women, if we face the facts squarely, we will see that our present plans to meet the problems of transition from wartime to peacetime industry are totally inadequate.

Let us therefore, apply the common sense of the scientist. If the scientist had to face up to a fact like this, he would start at once to remedy the situation. Let us be courageous enough to do the same thing.

I can see from the letters which I am receiving every day, that the people of this nation are realizing more and more that problems of this nature cannot be solved within the framework of the existing financial system any more than a modern washing machine could have been produced beneath the spreading chestnut tree where the village smithy stood. You see, it takes new methods, new systems, to solve new problems, whether those problems lie in the sphere of science or economics or health or education or anything else. It is most encouraging to me to learn from your letters that the people of Canada not only

know this to be true, but that they are getting anxious about it and are busy organizing into groups which will be able to demand that new principles of economics be applied to the solution of our present problems and ills.

Well now, Mr. Scientist, what next? We must now make our survey. We must find out exactly the nature and volume of the products of industry which will be necessary to raise the standard of living of the people to the level which the use of our natural resources will maintain. Are you in favor of that being done? If not, why not?

Then we must make a survey of all our wartime industries. By this survey we will determine what industries can be converted to making the products needed in peacetime. Then, when we have decided what wartime industries can be converted to serve peacetime requirements, we can make definite plans to bring about the conversion with the least possible interruption. These surveys can all be done before the War is over.

All right now—that takes care of ourselves for the moment. Now we must think also about our neighbors. Remember that the Nazis have pillaged and plundered the countries which they have over-run. If we are to make lasting friendships with these people, we must go to their rescue not only with arms and the machines of war, but with food, clothing and the other necessities of life. We must get busy now

to arrange our affairs in such a way that our industries will be able to switch almost overnight from wartime to peacetime production so that we will be ready to serve not only our own people, but also the beleaguered peoples of the world with the things they need.

The question then arises, "How can all these things be financed? Where is the money coming from?" That question brings us face to face with the cold and undeniable fact that we can never achieve our objective so long as money and credit are regarded as a limited commodity. The old system of private monopoly control over currency and credit must go. It is through — finished — outworn and worn out. It is as inadequate as was the old system where every business house had to employ its own couriers to carry letters from one place to another. When that old system of handling mail broke down, the government stepped in to take over the postal services for the nation. The time has arrived when the government must assume complete administration of the issue of currency and the control of credit. When that has been done, when the motive of profit and power is taken out of the business of banking, and only then, will it be possible for the government to order the financial policies of Canada in such a manner that money and credit will be available for the financing of post-war reconstruction.

Only when the issuance of currency and the control of credit has become solely

a duty of the state will it be possible to provide sufficient purchasing power to eliminate the bottleneck in pre-war distribution. Only when money and credit become tokens of effort or of the right of people everywhere to enjoy to the full the products of this earth, can it be possible for all to enjoy the standards of living to which they are entitled.

Therefore, the spearhead of our purpose is clear, clean-cut and indisputably definite. Just as the village smithy has given place to the modern factory, so must the present financial system of private monopoly control be vested in the government. This is the Christian way of preparing for this important transition.

I urge you to organize so that, at any instant's notice, you will be able to make your united voice and influence felt at Ottawa to achieve this purpose.

SAFEGUARD AGAINST INFLATION AND DEFLATION

To begin with, I have rather a pertinent question to ask you, one that may seem a little strange, and yet, I assure you, I am asking it in all seriousness. Tell me, do you believe in Black Magic?

You know, in the dim past, many thousands of years ago, when mankind was grouped into savage tribes, black magic was something very real to those ancestors of ours. In their ignorance about God and the world in which they lived so precariously, their lives were dominated by the fear of the unknown.

Under those conditions it was a very simple matter for the more cunning and unscrupulous among them to work on their fears, in order to obtain influence and power over them. Thus pagan priests and medicine men became familiar and tyrannical bosses in these primitive tribes, wield-

ing an autocratic power over the people that was beyond all reason. And that power was based entirely upon the superstitious beliefs which they built up and established by their crude but effective propaganda and false teaching. The most potent weapon of superstition which these priests and medicine men wielded was what was known as "taboo". That became a terrifying, awe-inspiring word that created immediate and slavish obedience.

Those poor, simple savages were so deluded into believing that if they did certain things forbidden by the decree of the priests or medicine man as being "taboo", dire consequences would immediately follow. So they submitted to all kinds of cruelty and oppression, fearing the terrible results of that awful word "taboo".

Now this curious belief in "taboo" seems to have been common to all primitive communities. In fact, it became a distinguishing characteristic of ignorant savagery. That is what we sometimes term Black Magic—the kind that is based on ignorance and superstition derived from the powers of darkness.

Probably I should apologize for talking about savages and their superstitious beliefs in "taboo" in this enlightened year of 1942. But then again, why should I? You may ask, "What in the world has that got to do with us and Post-War Reconstruction problems?"

I was hoping that you would ask me that. Are you sure that we are living in a

really enlightened age? Are you certain that we have all advanced so far that we have left superstitious beliefs and "taboo" of ancient savagery far behind us?

Of course you know that we still have superstitions: What about that one of walking under a ladder; and the one about Friday the Thirteenth; and the superstition about lighting three cigarettes with one match; or of the black cat? Are they not relics of the superstitions of savage life?

Yes! And the matter goes much deeper than that, ladies and gentlemen. This old savage acceptance of "taboo", complete with its cult of pagan superstition, still has us firmly in its grip, and some of us have not yet recognized it.

Strange as it may seem to you, I have been leading up to my subject for tonight: "Safeguards Against Inflation and Deflation" in a reconstructed post-war order. I can hear you exclaim in surprise, "Good gracious! What ever has that got to do with "taboos" and superstitions and black magic?" Please listen to me carefully, and I am sure you will agree that the two subjects are very closely linked together.

I believe it is generally recognized today that any suggestions for reforming our social and economic system which do not involve a reform of our monetary arrangements is just so much idle, futile and foolish chatter. Practically all the evils from which we have suffered during those horrible pre-war depression years can be traced directly to an inadequate money

system. Is that not plain to you?

Tell me, why was there poverty amidst plenty? Not because we could not produce the goods! Oh, No! You remember that every industry was trying to sell its products piled high on its shelves. There was no problem of production then. And it was not because we lacked facilities for distributing those goods. Our transportation systems and the great network of retail stores were, like industry, falling over themselves to get business. But the majority of people had to go without the goods that could have been provided in abundance (as the war has proved) simply because they could not buy them. That is, they lacked purchasing power.

It does not matter what aspect of pre-war conditions you consider, it leads back to the inadequacy of the money system. In other words, the restrictions imposed upon the people before the war, were imposed through the improper functioning of our money system. And the main cause of our restricted economy was that the people did not get enough purchasing power to buy the goods which could be produced and which was their right to enjoy.

That is not theory, ladies and gentlemen. It is a fact which is supported by the evidence of what actually happened. Moreover, any lingering doubts that some of you may have had, should be dispelled after three years of wartime conditions under which the myth of money scarcity has been exposed.

Now surely it should be obvious that the only way in which it is possible to deal with a system which, on the evidence of our past experience, does not distribute sufficient purchasing power. Yet whenever anyone suggests that the money system should be reformed along such lines, he is met with shouts of: "Taboo! That would be inflation! Remember what happened in Germany after the last war! !", etc., and so on. That, ladies and gentlemen, is the modern edition of the primitive cry of the pagan priests: "Taboo! Taboo! Taboo!"

The parallel is perfect. Years ago a few men more cunning and unscrupulous than the rest realized the force of the saying, "They who control the things that people want, control the people." "Permit me to control the money system and I care not who makes the laws."

Anticipating that we were progressing rapidly towards a money economy under which money would become **the** essential means of enabling individuals to do and use things, they worked out a complex and ingenious scheme by which they could get control of the world's money systems. It was based on superstition—or, if you like, black magic. They got people to believe that the amount of goods they could produce and use had to be limited, because the amount of money they could have, depended upon the very limited amount of gold at their disposal. By gaining control of the gold, the money man-

ipulators very soon controlled all money systems.

It sounds silly to us now that people should have believed that their production had to be limited by gold, but remember until a few years ago this superstition about gold was generally accepted.

So gold became the symbol of a pagan cult of materialism, known as finance. The whole affair was surrounded with mystery and people were led to believe that it was a subject only for super-men; that it was beyond the understanding of ordinary folk. And this new pagan religion established its priests and its temples. They called the temples banks. And behind this set-up the whole business of money-manipulation was carried out in such a way that the people were always controlled by the financial high-priests. If their system imposed harsh conditions and the people objected, the money manipulators were ever ready to point out that it was due to the laziness of workers, or to the greed of employers or to the incompetence of governments.

If anyone dared to suggest it was the money system which was at fault, the cry of "taboo! taboo!" was raised—for the money system was sacred and no voice must be raised against it. If it was suggested that more money was needed, the same financial high-priests immediately with one voice began to shout: "Inflation! Taboo!" Beware of Inflation and high prices."

However, that little racket stands ex-

posed today as the greatest swindle which has ever been perpetrated upon enlightened people. No wonder Christ drove the money-changers out of the temple. He saw the whole thing, but He was ahead of our day. At long last we have been enlightened and are on the threshold of the most important reformation in history—the reform of the money system.

The first step in this great reform will be for Parliament, on behalf of the people, to exercise the sole right of issuing all money—both currency and credit, through the appointment of a Government Commission for that purpose.

Next, in order to remove the main cause of the restrictions imposed upon us before the war, we must deal with the chronic shortage of purchasing power which the present system creates. The way in which this must be accomplished is to make up the deficiency by issuing the extra money required direct to consumers.

For example, to make it simple, suppose we assume that it is found that the people have only \$100,000 with which to buy goods priced at \$200,000, then \$100,000 of new purchasing power must be distributed to make up the deficiency. It is surely evident that it will be no use merely increasing wages by that amount, because wages are a cost of production and therefore would at once be included in prices, so that prices would rise and every dollar would buy less. That would cause this dreaded inflation.

It therefore follows that the money must be paid out in such a way that it does not increase prices. That is, it must be paid direct to the consumers. But you say, "How will this be done?" There are many ways. Here are a few:

Suppose the Government authority responsible for issuing money, said to retail merchants: "Provided you do not exceed a fair ratio of profit on your turnover, you can sell your goods at a discount of 20% and we will pay you the difference between what you receive from the public and the ordinary selling price of your goods."

Now taking our former example of the purchasing power being \$100,000 and the prices of goods being \$200,000; the effect of my suggestion would be the same as distributing \$40,000 to consumers by reducing prices 20% or from \$200,000 to \$160,000. Then there would still be \$60,000 of new money to be issued to the people. This could be done by means of increased adequate old age pensions, family allowances, and other social security measures. Thus it would be possible to reduce prices, reduce taxation and provide adequate social security for all. Do you follow that?

Of course you must realize that in order to carry this out, the Government Commission responsible for issuing money would have to make sure that at all times they knew just how much purchasing power people had, and what goods were

available on the market. It would be their responsibility to keep proper records and make sure that a balance was maintained at all times between purchasing power and prices—prices computed on a fair basis for all.

And suppose they found at any time that there was a surplus of purchasing power? Well, the government would withdraw it by means of an equitable system of taxation, so that the balance between prices and purchasing power would be constantly maintained. This withdrawal process would not likely be necessary for years, or at least until the great spread which is causing so much poverty is eliminated.

So you see, ladies and gentlemen, it is quite possible to increase people's incomes and actually decrease prices. There need be no inflation under which prices rise as money incomes are increased, or deflation under which prices are forced down below economic levels simply because people's incomes are insufficient to buy the goods.

I have to smile at times when I remember how the financial high-priests and their side-kicks ridiculed us and our suggestions in 1935 to 1939, and now these same iconoclast buccaneers, under the pressure of wartime conditions attempt to introduce the very principle I have outlined, I mean—the bonusing of consumer purchases, but they back into it and knock the sides out of everything. The prices of

tea, coffee, milk, and so forth, are now subsidized by the government as the Minister of Finance announced recently. The thing that I cannot understand is why do they go about it in a restricted, haphazard, hit-or-miss manner, with all kinds of bureaucratic controls, when it can be done efficiently and scientifically in a proper manner to everyone's advantage? The trouble is, they do not understand what it is all about. No wonder we have so much confusion.

POTENTIAL PRODUCTION

“The Potential output is far greater than before. If all employable labour were employed for a reasonable number of hours per week, the world would have at its disposal a volume of commodities and services which would enable the entire population to live on a higher level of comfort and well-being than has ever been contemplated in the rosiest dreams of the social reformer. Our task is to bring consumption and production into proper relationship — not a simple, but quite a possible task.”

His Majesty King Edward VIII.

I N D E X

	Page
No. 1—	
Planning for Reconstruction.....	3
No. 2—	
Victory in War and Peace.....	12
No. 3—	
Canadian Morale	
The Spearhead to Victory.....	21
No. 4—	
The Return Soldier Problem.....	29
No. 5—	
Problems of Agriculture.....	38
No. 6—	
National Health in the	
Post-War Order	47
No. 7—	
Unemployment, Work	
and Wages	56
No. 8—	
Some Questions Answered.....	66
No. 9—	
Wartime to Peacetime	
Industry	75
No. 10—	
Safeguard Against	
Inflation and Deflation	85

MODERN PRESS