

ing it—that appears to be the only method by which the nations to-day propose to get rid of the problem facing them, the problem of distributing the enormous production of industry. That is the supreme problem of all. But instead of applying themselves to experimental economics with courage and vision, we find leaders everywhere shrinking back from the task, or flying to the fossil room of the British Museum, having for their object apparently the discovery of the quickest and easiest method by which they may destroy the wealth that has been produced by man in cooperation with the Almighty. There were people in the old days who would have said that we should deserve to be visited by a famine. It may be true still; we still deserve it, for the stupidity of the actions and the attitude of statesmen and leaders throughout the world justifies the punishment. If the people have confidence in such leaders, and countenance the continuance of policies of this sort, then the people will deserve what their leaders already deserve.

And so we find this strange comment in a newspaper in the United States. The Cleveland Press carried the following item:

The most striking evidence that has come to our attention of a popular realization of a change in the old order is the following item, which appeared in this newspaper's columns of church news:

"Prayer for more bountiful crops for the farmer, usual to Episcopal services on Rogation Sunday, was modified throughout the Ohio diocese. Officials felt the appeal would not be in accord with the government policy of limiting crop production. So prayer was offered instead for improved means of produce distribution."

That last at least was intelligent. Commenting on this dispatch, the Cleveland Press observed editorially:

Are we going to see the time when the President of the United States—

Or, for that matter, the Prime Minister of Canada.

—will call on us to give thanks the last Thursday in November because the harvests were not so bountiful as usual?

As a matter of fact, I did hear some whispering about the sigh of relief that went up when a news dispatch to London intimated the fact that the grasshopper menace was an exceedingly serious matter in western Canada and that the crop was not likely to be as large as had been anticipated. On top of that, turn to other parts of the world and what do you see? You find Egypt, by law, trying to limit the cotton crop in 1926—why? Was it because the people of Egypt and the

[Mr. E. J. Garland.]

people of the world at large had then enough cotton? Not at all. It was because, under the present system of overcapitalization, it was impossible for them to sell their products at a profit, and unless they were sold at a profit production would not continue. In the state of Texas an attempt was also made to limit production—an attempt which the authorities sought to enforce with the aid of the state militia, and which failed. And why was that attempt made there, to limit production? Was it because the people in that state had a sufficiency of cotton goods? No. Is industry concerned with the supplying of goods? Is that the motive anywhere? That is not the motive under the present system. Ask any manufacturer what his motive is and you will find that the sole question is as to what can be made out of production; it is not a question of supplying human needs.

Again, turn to Brazil, and the classical example given the world a year ago when they destroyed a million sacks of coffee. Was it because there was enough coffee in the world? Ask the farmers of western Canada; ask the unemployed throughout this dominion and the United States, who at that time numbered some twelve or thirteen millions. The world had not then enough coffee; yet one million sacks of coffee was destroyed. And the same is true of sugar and of rubber. Indeed, we find some of the natives being sent out to chop down the rubber plantations which a few years ago they had laboriously cultivated. Imagine the insanity of the system. On top of this coffee destruction that occurred a year ago the world conference received a recommendation from France with regard to the limitation of the production of certain commodities. That world conference was sitting in what I am told is the fossil room of the British Museum—whoever decided that that should be the place for the world conference had a fine sense of humour—and it was the day following the dispatch, on the 16th of June last, with regard to the destruction of coffee in Brazil that a recommendation was made by France for the artificial limitation of the production of a long list of basic commodities. Was not that an intelligent contribution to the problem?

And now for the following dispatch from Sao Paulo, Brazil, through the Associated Press:

The Sao Paulo State Coffee Institute urged the government Thursday to sanction the burning quickly of nearly six million sacks of retained coffee—